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#### Advantage 1 is FRAND:

#### Standards-Setting Organizations (SSO’s) are industry members who jointly establish standards for information tech defined by the adoption of standard-essential patents (SEP’s), which are licensed to companies who wish to implement the tech in their product, called implementers, on Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory (FRAND) terms. Current standards promote price gouging, FRAND enforcement is critical.

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

I. Standard Setting and the Competitive Process

The fundamental economics in the information technology sector, driven by network effects, implies that there is enormous value associated with establishing compatibility standards. Popular standards include the mobile broadband standards used in cell phones, which are established by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), and the Wi-Fi technology for wireless local area networks, which is enabled by the 802.11 standard established by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).4

There are many SSOs, and their rules and procedures differ considerably. In addition to IEEE, leading SSOs include the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).5 SSOs generally establish standards by holding a series of committee meetings among industry participants. These meetings culminate in a vote on a technical specification that describes what features or attributes a product must have in order to comply with the standard. Most SSOs are open to all industry participants and seek to operate on a consensus basis, applying certain voting rules. SSOs do not normally engage in patent licensing, nor do they specify how patent royalties will be divided up among patent holders. They leave that to their members, which in some cases form patent pools to address these issues.6

SSOs adopt specific policies relating to intellectual property rights (IPRs).7 These IPR policies are generally intended to enable the SEP holders to obtain reasonable royalties for licensing their patents, while prohibiting them from charging excessive royalties after other industry participants have committed to the standard. At that point, firms committed to implementing the standard— which we call “implementers”—would find it very costly to avoid using the patented technology. For this purpose, most SSOs require SEP owners to license their SEPs on FRAND terms.8

FRAND policies are especially necessary because negotiations between SEP holders and implementers generally take place only after the implementers have used and infringed the technologies claimed by the SEPs. Standards involving information and communications technology can involve hundreds or even thousands of SEPs, many with uncertain boundaries for infringement. In addition, a time lag exists between patent application and patent issuance. For these and other reasons, it is impractical for implementers to enter into negotiations for patent licenses with all SEP owners prior to the establishment of a standard and to their implementation of it.9

The fact that patent negotiations generally do not take place until after implementers have used and infringed the technologies has several critical implications. First, at the time of negotiation, implementers are locked into the standard and the technologies claimed by the SEPs—that is, the cost to switch to an alternative technology or standard at that point—ex post—is much greater than it was ex ante, before the patented technology was first included in the standard. Ex post, the patent holder is no longer competing to have its technology included in the standard, nor is it competing to have implementers of the standard use its technology. Instead, because the patent holder owns an asset that is essential to the standard, implementers have no choice but to use the patented technology.

If the standard is commercially successful, implementers are willing to pay a much larger royalty for use of the patented technology than they would have paid ex ante, when the SEP holder faced competition from other technologies. In these circumstances, the SEP holder can be said to have obtained monopoly power in the market in which the patented technology is licensed for use in implementing the standard.10

Second, because of lock-in and the implementer’s ongoing infringement, the potential for litigation looms large in licensing negotiations. In effect, the parties are negotiating about how to settle an infringement suit, and that negotiation is heavily influenced by their predictions as to what the court will do if they cannot agree. This situation is not unique to SEPs; it arises frequently when firms are faced with patent infringement claims for products they have independently developed or technologies they have inadvertently infringed. Patent law addresses such instances by specifying that patent holders are entitled to “reasonable royalties,” defined as the royalties that the parties would have negotiated prior to the infringement and thus prior to lock-in.11 Those hypothetical ex ante royalties reflect the market value of the patent license. Notwithstanding the law’s embrace of this principle, however, as a practical matter, patent holders are generally able to recover more than the ex ante value of the patent when litigation occurs after the implementers are locked in. Further, negotiations in the shadow of litigation after lock-in tend to result in royalties in excess of the ex ante or market value of the patented technology.12

Third, the shadow of litigation is particularly problematic in the communications and technology sector, in which products typically include hundreds or thousands of patented technologies. A court-ordered injunction involving such products would deprive the implementer of not only the value of the technology covered by the patent-in-suit, but also the value of the entire product.13 Implementers that are forced to bear the risk of an injunction are thus induced to agree to royalties greater than those that would be appropriate if only the value of the patented technology were at stake. Those royalties systematically provide SEP holders with excessive compensation in comparison with the benchmark of ex ante royalties.

These implications of lock-in and ex post dealings are well-understood: they represent an example of the general concept of lock-in and opportunism developed by Oliver Williamson.14 The Federal Circuit has also recognized the market distortions caused by the inclusion of patented technologies in public standards and the resulting danger of patent holdup involving SEPs.15

For these and other reasons, the SEP holder has ex post monopoly power that, if left unchecked, would enable it to obtain royalties far in excess of the royalties that it could earn in a competitive market.16 To address this common problem and limit ex post opportunism by SEP holders, SSOs typically require participants that own SEPs to make certain FRAND commitments. In particular, by requiring a commitment to license on “fair and reasonable” terms, the FRAND requirement aims to prevent, or at least reduce, the extent of monopoly pricing by SEP holders. And by requiring a commitment to license on “nondiscriminatory” terms, the FRAND requirement can prevent SEP holders from extracting monopoly premiums by selective licensing or, more important, migrating their monopoly power from the FRAND-regulated market to unregulated standard-implementing product markets by licensing to only one or a few implementers or licensing to selected implementers on discriminatorily favorable terms.

#### Patent holdup is accentuated by the Ninth Circuit’s recent decision in *FTC v. Qualcomm* that permits ICT firms to engage in innovation-stifling conduct with antitrust impunity.

Moss 20, \*Alex Moss is a Staff Attorney on EFF’s intellectual property team, before joining EFF, Alex practiced complex commercial litigation at Sullivan & Cromwell LLP in New York and Durie Tangri LLP in San Francisco; (August 26th, 2020, “Throwing Out the FTC's Suit Against Qualcomm Moves Antitrust Law in the Wrong Direction”, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2020/08/throwing-out-ftcs-suit-against-qualcomm-moves-antitrust-law-wrong-direction)

Standards can enhance competition and consumer choice, but they also massively inflate the value of patents deemed essential to the standard, and give their owners the power to sue companies that implement the standard for money damages or injunctions to block them from using their SEPs. When standards cover critical features like wireless connectivity, SEP owners wield a huge amount of “hold-up” power because their patents allow them to effectively block access to the standard altogether. That lets them charge unduly large tolls to anyone who wants to implement the standard.

To minimize that risk, standard-setting organizations typically require companies that want their patented technology incorporated into a standard to promise in advance to license their SEPs to others on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. But that promise strikes at a key tension between antitrust and patent law: patent owners have no obligation to let anyone use technology their patent covers, but to get those technologies incorporated into standards, patent owners usually have to promise that they will give permission to anyone who wants to implement the standard as long as they pay a reasonable license fee.

Qualcomm is one of the most important and dominant companies in the history of wireless communication standards. It is a multinational conglomerate that has owned patents on every major wireless communication standard since its first CDMA patent in 1985, and it participates in the standard-setting organizations that define those standards. Qualcomm is somewhat unique in that it not only licenses SEPs, but also supplies the modem chips used by a wide range of devices. These include chips that implement wireless communication standards, which lie at the heart of every mobile computing device.

Although Qualcomm promised to license its SEPs (including patents essential to CDMA, 3G, 4G, and 5G) on FRAND terms, its conduct has to many looked unfair, unreasonable, and highly discriminatory. In particular, Qualcomm has drawn scrutiny for bundling tens of thousands of patents together—including many that are not standard-essential—and offering portfolio-only licenses no matter what licensees actually want or need; refusing to sell modem chips to anyone without a SEP license and threatening to withhold chips from companies trying to negotiate different license terms; refusing to license anyone other than original-equipment manufacturers (OEMs); and insisting on royalties calculated as a percentage of the sale price of a handset sold to end users for hundreds of dollars, despite the minimal contribution of any particular patent to the retail value.

In 2017, the U.S. Federal Trade Commission [sued](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2017/01/ftc-charges-qualcomm-monopolizing-key-semiconductor-device-used) Qualcomm for violating both sections of the Sherman Antitrust Act by engaging in a number of anticompetitive SEP licensing practices. In May 2019, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California agreed with the FTC, identifying numerous instances of Qualcomm’s unlawful, anticompetitive conduct in a comprehensive [233-page opinion](https://www.eff.org/document/ftc-v-qualcomm-district-court-opinion). We were pleased to see the FTC take action and the district court credit the overwhelming evidence that Qualcomm’s conduct is corrosive to market-based competition and threatens to cement Qualcomm’s dominance for years to come.

But this month, a panel of judges from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit unanimously [overturned](https://www.eff.org/document/ninth-circuit-opinion-ftc-v-qualcomm) the district court’s decision, reasoning that Qualcomm’s conduct was “hypercompetitive” but not “anticompetitive,” and therefore not a violation of antitrust law. To reach that result, the Ninth Circuit made the patent grant more powerful and antitrust law weaker than ever.

According to the Ninth Circuit, patent owners don’t have a duty to let anyone use what their patent covers, and therefore Qualcomm had no duty to license its SEPs to anyone. But that framing requires ignoring the promises Qualcomm made to license its SEPs on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms—promises that courts in this country and around the world have consistently enforced. It also means ignoring antitrust principles like the essential facilities doctrine, which limits the ability of a monopolist with hold-up power over an essential facility (like a port) to shut out rivals. Instead, the Ninth Circuit held rather simplistically that a duty to deal could arise only if the monopolist had provided access, and then reversed its policy.

But even when Qualcomm restricted its licensing policies in critical ways, the Ninth Circuit found reasons to approve those restrictions. For example, Qualcomm stopped licensing its patents to chip manufacturers and started licensing them only to OEMs. This had a major benefit: it let Qualcomm charge a much higher royalty rate based on the high retail price of the end user devices, like smartphones and tablets, that OEMs make and sell. If Qualcomm had continued to license to chip suppliers, its patents would be “exhausted” once the chips were sold to OEMs, extinguishing Qualcomm’s right to assert its patents and control how the chips were used.

Patent exhaustion is a century-old doctrine that protects the rights of consumers to use things they buy without getting the patent owner’s permission again and again. Patent exhaustion is important because it prevents price-gouging, but also because it protects space for innovation by letting people use things they buy freely, including to build innovations of their own. The doctrine thus helps patent law serve its underlying goal—promoting economic growth and innovation. In other words, the doctrine of exhaustion is baked into the patent grant; it is not optional. Nevertheless, the Ninth Circuit wholeheartedly approved of Qualcomm’s efforts to avoid exhaustion—even when that meant cutting off access to previous licensees (chip-makers) in ways that let Qualcomm charge far more in licensing fees than its SEPs could possibly have contributed to the retail value of the final product.

It makes no sense that Qualcomm could contract around a fundamental principle like patent exhaustion, but at the same time did not assume any antitrust duty to deal under these circumstances. Worse, it’s harmful for the economy, innovation, and consumers. Unfortunately, the kind of harm that antitrust law recognizes is limited to harm affecting “competition” or the “competitive process.” Antitrust law, at least as the Ninth Circuit interprets it, doesn’t do nearly enough to address the harm downstream consumers experience when they pay inflated prices for high-tech devices, and miss out on innovation that might have developed from fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory licensing practices.

We hope the FTC sticks to its guns and asks the Ninth Circuit to go en banc and reconsider this decision. Otherwise, antitrust law will become an even weaker weapon against innovation-stifling conduct in technology markets.

#### Weakened antitrust enforcement emboldens firms to follow Qualcomm’s lead, which collapses FRAND integrity.

Hovenkamp 20, \*Herbert J. Hovenkamp is James G. Dinan University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania; (2020, “FRAND and Antitrust”, <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3095&context=faculty_scholarship>)

While the FRAND process has been highly productive, it is also fragile. Firms are tempted to make commitments at the beginning when the incentive to join is large, but renege on them later when they can profit by doing so. At least in this particular case, private FRAND enforcement had not worked very well. Qualcomm had been able to violate FRAND commitments in order to exclude rivals and obtain higher royalties than FRAND would permit, largely with impunity. Other firms will very likely follow Qualcomm’s lead. If that happens the FRAND system will fall apart, doing irreparable injury to the modern wireless telecommunications network or, at the very least, diminishing the leadership role of the United States in preserving effective network competition.

While governments can be heavily involved in standard set-ting,9 the implementation of technical standards in information technologies is largely the work of private actors. Government involvement is limited mainly to enforcement of contract, intellectual property, or antitrust law. As private actors, those involved in standard setting or compliance are fully subject to the federal antitrust laws.

This Article addresses one question: when is an SSO participant’s violation of a FRAND commitment an antitrust violation, and if it is, of what kind and what are the implications for remedies? It warns against two extremes. One is thinking that any violation of a FRAND commitment is an antitrust violation as well. In the first instance FRAND obligations are contractual, and most breaches of contract do not violate any antitrust law. The other extreme is thinking that, because a FRAND violation is a breach of contract, it cannot also be an antitrust violation. The question of an antitrust violation does not de-pend on whether the conduct breached a particular agreement but rather on whether it caused competitive harm. This can happen because the conduct restrained trade under section 1 of the Sherman Act, was unreasonably exclusionary under section 2 of the Sherman Act, or amounted to an anticompetitive condition or understanding as defined by section 3 of the Clay-ton Act.10 The end goal is to identify practices that harm com-petition, thereby injuring consumers.

The Ninth Circuit’s Qualcomm decision will make antitrust violations in the context of FRAND licensing much more difficult to prove, even in cases where anticompetitive behavior and consumer harm seem clear.11 Indeed, in this case the court itself acknowledged the harm to consumers but appeared to think that they were not entitled to protection.12 If this decision stands, FRAND obligations will to a larger extent have to be settled through private litigation and the federal antitrust enforcement agencies will have a diminished role. Anticompetitive behavior by one firm that is not effectively disciplined will lead others to do the same thing.

#### Monopoly pricing and selective licensing undermines 5G innovation---FRAND enforcement is key.

Actonline 20, the App Association represents more than 5,000 app companies and information technology firms across the mobile economy; (August 26th, 2020, “Save Our Standards: The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Reverses Decision in FTC v. Qualcomm”, <https://actonline.org/2020/08/26/save-our-standards-the-ninth-circuit-court-of-appeals-reverses-decision-in-ftc-v-qualcomm/>)
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Moreover, the FRAND agreement is a critical tool used by standard setting organizations to ensure the process enhances competition and does not run afoul of antitrust laws. Generally, a collaboration between competitors to choose market winners or set prices raises significant questions for competition regulators. Royalty free and FRAND licensing requirements were created by standards bodies to avoid potential antitrust scrutiny by limiting the market power and the potential for abuse by those involved in developing a standard. This is why the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) will not accredit any standards developing organization (SDO) that does not require standard-essential patent holders to provide licensing terms at least as favorable as FRAND.

The most important beneficiary of open interoperability standards and FRAND licensing requirements are the entrepreneurs and small businesses that have long fueled America’s innovation engine. They don’t have giant patent portfolios, market power, or the resources to hire legions of lawyers and spend years battling SEP abusers in civil court. Without some level of certainty about their ability to obtain licenses—let alone what they may cost—entrepreneurs will have trouble justifying the pursuit of any innovation that uses a standard and will certainly struggle to raise money from investors for such innovation. And Qualcomm’s vague and toothless promise simply “not to sue” smaller companies and component makers is no substitute for a license.

The adoption of 5G technology is expected to open unprecedented opportunities for innovation and economic growth as we move toward a world where everything from cars to tractors to buildings will connect to wireless networks. At every stage of the information technology revolution, America has been the undisputed leader because of the unparalleled entrepreneurial innovation ecosystem that we have built. If 5G SEP holders are able to arbitrarily refuse licenses to smaller firms, it would ~~cripple~~ undermine America’s innovation ecosystem at the start of the next big wave of innovation. As economic tensions continue to rise with China, Chinese-based companies could use their 5G SEPs as international economic weapons to thwart U.S. competitors.

The 5G standard is supposed to be a platform for competition, innovation, and entrepreneurship, but if the Ninth Circuit decision is allowed to stand, it will become a chokepoint for snuffing out competitors and demanding monopoly rents. Open standards and FRAND licensing commitments are fundamental to competition in the modern economy, and the idea that they aren’t a subject for antitrust enforcement is patently absurd.

#### The absence of domestic 5G competition cedes leadership in technical standards to China.

Duan 19, \*Charles Duan is a senior fellow and associate director of tech & innovation policy at the R Street Institute, where he focuses his research on intellectual property issues; (February 5th, 2019, “Why China Is Winning the 5G War”, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-china-winning-5g-war-43347)

There is little doubt today that American superiority in the next generation of mobile communications, commonly called 5G, is a matter of extraordinary national concern. There is also little doubt that China is a strong competitor, already having outspent the United States by [$24 billion](https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/technology-media-telecommunications/us-tmt-5g-deployment-imperative.pdf#page=3) and planning [$411 billion](https://www.scmp.com/tech/china-tech/article/2098948/china-plans-28-trillion-yuan-capital-expenditure-create-worlds) in 5G investment over the next decade. The Chinese government has also laid out multiple national plans for establishing the country as a leader in mobile technology, and the Chinese firm Huawei is poised to be the [top smartphone manufacturer](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/11/16/huawei-aims-to-overtake-samsung-as-no-1-smartphone-player-by-2020.html) by 2020.

And what are United States companies doing about this? Bickering over patents.

For years, the leading American supplier of advanced mobile communications chips has been the San Diego-based Qualcomm. The company has been an innovator of mobile technology, but it has also been a remarkable innovator of convoluted legal strategies. As an ongoing Federal Trade Commission [lawsuit alleges](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2017/01/ftc-charges-qualcomm-monopolizing-key-semiconductor-device-used), Qualcomm has used its dominant position as a chip supplier and its extensive patent holdings to weave an intricate web of patent licensing across the mobile industry. The effect of that complex licensing scheme, the FTC claims, has been to force competitor chipmakers out of the market and to extract concessions and high patent royalties from smartphone and mobile-device makers.

Qualcomm today faces only one major U.S. competitor—Intel, whose chips Apple recently [started using](https://www.cultofmac.com/484250/intel-reaping-rewards-apples-scrap-qualcomm/) instead of Qualcomm’s. Not surprisingly, Qualcomm has leveraged its patents to force a retaliatory investigation against Apple, the effect of which could be, as an administrative judge [recently determined](http://www.fosspatents.com/2018/10/itc-judge-didnt-buy-testimony-for-which.html), to boot Intel out of the mobile-chip market and leave Qualcomm as a monopoly.

It is hard to imagine that this infighting among Apple, Intel and Qualcomm is getting the United States very far in 5G, and it is harder to imagine that Qualcomm’s desired outcome would do so, either. The best path, instead, is the obvious one: allowing competition and expanding the number of firms working on 5G.

Competition encourages companies to out-innovate each other in order to grab market share. Of particular importance to 5G, competition leads to [better cybersecurity](https://morningconsult.com/opinions/in-the-race-to-5g-monopoly-considered-harmful/) in products, making them less vulnerable to hacking or misuse.

Competition is especially crucial when it comes to the technical standards that define how 5G works. These standards are the work of 3GPP, an international consortium of technology companies in the field. Chinese players such as Huawei and ZTE are major participants in 3GPP. Ensuring that 3GPP’s standards reflect American values requires having as many American companies at the negotiating table as possible—which is harder to achieve when those companies are trying to sue each other out of business.

Certainly patents themselves, as rewards for new inventions, are a driver of innovation in areas such as 5G. The problem, though, is not the existence of a patent system but the ever-expanding power of the patent laws, which encourage companies to pour dollars into complex patent licensing and assertion schemes—as companies like Qualcomm have done—rather than to perform the hard work of building new technologies. When innovation in patent strategy is more profitable than actual innovation, we lose the race to 5G and other technologies.

But don’t take my word for it. [Multiple members of Congress](https://www.patentprogress.org/2019/01/11/congress-weighs-in-on-qualcomm-and-apple-at-the-itc/), from both sides of the aisle, have denounced the use of patents to kick companies like Intel out of 5G development, predicting that such actions would “dampen the quality, innovation, competitive pricing, and in this case the preservation of a strong U.S. presence in the development of 5G and thus the national security of the United States.”

Or look to what China itself is doing. The Chinese government is handing out rewards left and right to encourage technology research and development. Indeed, it grants subsidies and financial benefits (ranging from the [ordinary](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2818503) to the [imperfect](https://funginstitute.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/patent_subsidy_Zhen.pdf) to the [bizarre](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/article/1681850/how-get-out-jail-early-china-buy-inventors-idea-and-patent-it)) to encourage its citizens to file for patents. But while China specifically encourages filing for patents, it does little to encourage using them: Patent infringement awards in court are peanuts—often only [five figures](https://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/btlj/vol33/iss2/2/)—and most Chinese patent owners drop their patents [within five years](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-26/china-claims-more-patents-than-any-country-most-are-worthless) of getting them. The message in China is clear: You will be rewarded for innovating, but not for quibbling over patents.

The United States should take the same tack if it wants to match China in 5G. Ever-stronger patent rights encourage counterproductive disputes that are a drag on industry, a drag on research and development, and ultimately a drag on domestic competitiveness on the global stage. If America wants to lead in 5G, then it must clear the path for strong competition among leading American technology companies.

#### Standards leadership allows China to export digital authoritarianism.

Drew et al. 21, \*Dr Alexi Drew, Research Associate, The Policy Institute, King’s College London; (May 7th, 2021, “The Critical Geopolitics of Standards Setting”, https://www.transatlantic-dialogue-on-china.rusi.org/article/the-critical-geopolitics-of-standards-setting)

However, this previously ‘western’ domain is challenged by a Chinese bloc of private industry actors with centrally directed, strategic motivations for their efforts who have managed to leverage the flaws of this system for political and economic advantage.  The market-driven self-regulation model of technical standards has proven itself unsustainable given the geopolitical power achievable through the control of these standards. The marketised approach is easily abusable by a technologically developed nation-state with geopolitical intentions firmly in mind.

Obscurity Through Complexity

Technical standards have the immediate appearance of being both apolitical and ethically neutral. This seems to set them apart from the debate over standards of state behaviour in [cyber space concerning espionage and actions below the threshold of armed conflict](https://www.cfr.org/blog/unexpectedly-all-un-countries-agreed-cybersecurity-report-so-what). Yet, technological standards are unequivocally connected to normative practices of international behaviour and ethics. The extremely complex nature of the standards under consideration in bodies such as the International Organization for Standardization, the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), and the Third Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) obscures the very tangible real-world impact that the standards they set have. The 3GPP is responsible for standards setting for mobile telecommunications. It covers everything from 5G through to autonomous vehicles and the Internet of Things. These are the bodies defining how the modern world is constructed.

On the one hand they appear quite benign, responsible for such banalities as the use of Universal Serial Bus (USB) connectors versus proprietary standards. This hardly seems a matter of national security importance. But the same process is responsible for what ultimately shape the basic operating parameters of facial recognition technology in closed circuit television systems, the level of centralised state control at the technical foundations of the internet, and the protections of personally identifiable data. These generate profound implications for international policy and ethics.

Internal Competition vs Strategic Direction

Technical standards setting processes have, historically, been dominated by private sector actors who have had both the capacity to develop a particular technology to the point of holding a significant market share, and the ability to use that market share to advocate for the standardisation of the technology in line with their own production. The market led approach has continued to be the prevailing model by which American companies have globalised the technical standards behind US dominated technological innovation. This privatised form of self-regulation for technology companies is only partially influenced by the approach taken within the EU where [some licensing of standards are controlled by state or EU led institutions.](https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui-publications/2019/ui-brief-no.-2-2019.pdf)

In contrast to this approach the Chinese model has involved a high level of state-oriented direction, oversight, and direct engagement on the creation and signing off technical standards. Efforts to harmonise and centralise technical standards domestically have become increasingly internationalised as the CCP takes this centralised, strategic approach to technical standards setting bodies such as the ITU, 3GPP, and IEC. Technical standards have also become an increasingly central component of the Digital Silk Road with the openly expressed goal of increasing uptake of Chinese technical standards in partner countries.

The implications of this clash between a system of technical standardisation that is driven by the market versus one driven by an authoritarian government subsidised model are a direct challenge to the development of free, open, and ethical technology. Standardisation mechanisms have become political, or rather there has been a gradual realisation of the political power to be gained from the control of technical standards. While the PRC might have come to this awareness first, the US and Europe have since had a rude awakening about the missed opportunity. The privatised model of technical standards setting favoured by European and US markets relies upon the dynamics of financial competition to regulate behaviour. This is in stark contrast to the statist Chinese model.

#### Causes global backsliding.

Kendall-Taylor et. al 20 \*Andrea Kendall-Taylor, senior fellow and director of the Transatlantic Security Program at the Center for a New American Security, co-author of Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes; Erica Frantz is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Michigan State University; Joseph Wright is Professor of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University; (March/April 2020, “The Digital Dictators,” Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-02-06/digital-dictators>)

The risk that technology will usher in a wave of authoritarianism is all the more concerning because our own empirical research has indicated that beyond buttressing autocracies, digital tools are associated with an increased risk of democratic backsliding in fragile democracies. New technologies are particularly dangerous for weak democracies because many of these digital tools are dual use: technology can enhance government efficiency and provide the capacity to address challenges such as crime and terrorism, but no matter the intentions with which governments initially acquire such technology, they can also use these tools to muzzle and restrict the activities of their opponents.

#### Democracy solves a litany of existential threats.

Diamond 19, Professor of Political Science and Sociology at Stanford University, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, PhD in Sociology from Stanford University, (Dr. Larry, Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition, and American Complacency, p. 199-202)

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world. This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose. Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally. It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good. To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society. In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet. Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence. Of course, democratically elected governments with open societies will not support the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its future to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory. If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors.

#### China 5G leadership compromise US military superiority

Borghard et al. 19, \*Erica D. Borghard is an Assistant Professor at the Army Cyber Institute at West Point. Shawn W. \*Lonergan is a U.S. Army Reserve officer assigned to 75th Innovation Command and a Research Scholar at the Army Cyber Institute. (April 25th, 2019, “The Overlooked Military Implications of the 5G Debate”, https://www.cfr.org/blog/overlooked-military-implications-5g-debate)

There are economic implications for which entities can secure the [greatest global market share](https://www.reuters.com/brandfeatures/venture-capital/article?id=61837) of 5G technology. Technological innovation drives economic growth, job creation, and global economic influence. Huawei may have a long-term market advantage over U.S and Western telecoms because the former has been able to offer 5G products at [far cheaper](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/26/us/politics/huawei-china-us-5g-technology.html) rates than the latter. Furthermore, there are also concerns that Chinese-built 5G technology is likely to [contain backdoors](https://www.wired.com/story/huawei-case-signals-new-us-china-cold-war-tech/) that could be used to enable [Chinese economic or national security espionage](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/05/huawei-would-have-to-give-data-to-china-government-if-asked-experts.html). It is unlikely that Beijing would actively monitor all of the content of the data that comes across Huawei owned or operated infrastructure (although it may collect and analyze metadata). However, it is conceivable that Huawei would get a proverbial “tap on the shoulder” from Beijing to share pertinent information in specific instances. This may include individually targeting senior corporate executives, which is enabled by the millimeter wave frequency that 5G networks employ.

The military applications of 5G technology have vital strategic and battlefield implications for the U.S. Historically, the U.S. military has reaped enormous advantages from employing cutting edge technology on the battlefield. 5G technology holds similar innovative potential. Perhaps most obviously, the next generation of telecommunications infrastructure will have a direct impact on improving military communications. However, it will also produce cascading effects on the development of other kinds of military technologies, such as robotics and artificial intelligence. For instance, artificial intelligence and machine learning capabilities, such as those used in the Department of Defense’s [Project Maven](https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1254719/project-maven-to-deploy-computer-algorithms-to-war-zone-by-years-end/), could be greatly enhanced when leveraging the data processing speeds made possible through 5G infrastructure. As an [era of great power competition](https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf) emerges between the United States and China, the United States has a compelling strategic interest in being at the forefront of these new technologies.

The United States and its allies must also consider the tactical and operational implications on the battlefield of conducting conventional or counterinsurgency operations in an area with Chinese owned or operated 5G infrastructure. This concern stems from the nature of the relationship between Huawei, an [ostensibly private company](https://www.itnews.com.au/news/analysis-who-really-owns-huawei-175946), and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). While Huawei’s founder and CEO, Ren Zhengfei proclaimed in a February 2019 interview on [CBS This Morning](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/ren-zhengfei-huawei-ceo-says-we-will-never-provide-chinese-government-with-any-information/)that the company never has and never would provide information to the Chinese government, many experts are [skeptical](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/05/huawei-would-have-to-give-data-to-china-government-if-asked-experts.html). Under China’s [2017 National Intelligence Law](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-security-lawmaking-idUSKBN19I1FW), the CCP has the authority to monitor and investigate domestic and international companies as well as direct organizations to assist with government espionage efforts. As such, it is conceivable that Huawei will be required to hand over its data to the Chinese government for collection and analysis.

Due to this reality, the United States must consider and be prepared to conduct overseas contingency or counterterrorism operations in areas where Chinese telecommunications infrastructure is widely proliferated, thus restricting the United States’ ability to rely on indigenous telecoms. As [noted](https://www.africom.mil/media-room/transcript/31604/gen-joseph-votel-gen-thomas-waldhauser-and-acting-asd-for-international-security-affairs-kathryn) by US AFRICOM Commander General Thomas Waldhauser, this has already become an issue in Africa where Chinese telecommunications companies are poised to dominate. The integrity of U.S. military communications systems that rely on 5G networks could be undermined at key phases of an operation. For example, if the United States is conducting a military operation in an area of interest to China, it is plausible that the Chinese government could leverage Huawei to intercept or even deny military communications. Furthermore, Chinese telecom infrastructure dominance in a theater of operations may limit the U.S. military’s ability to conduct precision targeting that leverages signals intelligence collection on 5G telecommunications networks.

The strategic and battlefield implications of who owns and operates 5G infrastructure around the world underscores the national security importance of 5G. The U.S. government and its allies should more systematically assess both the opportunities and risks associated with conducting future military operations in environments that rely on Chinese technology.

To date, the U.S. government has devoted significant energy to persuading its allies and partners to follow the United States in prohibiting Chinese telecoms, particularly Huawei, from building and/or operating 5G infrastructure. However, its diplomatic approach has been met with varying degrees of success. While some countries such as [Australia](https://www.ft.com/content/e90c3800-aad3-11e8-94bd-cba20d67390c) and [Japan](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-huawei-japan/japans-top-three-telcos-to-exclude-huawei-zte-network-equipment-kyodo-idUSKBN1O90JW) have fallen in line with the U.S. stance on Huawei, many others have not. The European Commission’s recent 5G [recommendations](https://www.cyberscoop.com/5g-eu-huawei-cybersecurity-recommendations/) for member states dismissed a ban on Chinese telecoms. British intelligence has reportedly maintained that the security risks associated with Huawei can be [sufficiently managed](https://www.ft.com/content/619f9df4-32c2-11e9-bd3a-8b2a211d90d5), and New Zealand, after [initially bandwagoning](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/28/business/huawei-new-zealand-papua-new-guinea.html) with the United States in December 2018, abruptly [reversed course](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-18/new-zealand-says-china-s-huawei-hasn-t-been-ruled-out-of-5g-role) in February 2019. This is concerning for the United States because New Zealand and the UK are members of the Five Eyes intelligence-sharing alliance. Many allies have refused an outright ban of Huawei because of the company’s ability to offer 5G products at far cheaper rates than Western telecoms.

It is clear that U.S. diplomatic efforts are not working. The reality is that the bottom line is largely driving decision-making. Therefore, rather than take a purely negative approach, the United States should consider using positive inducements to make its 5G products more appealing. While the United States should not strive to mirror China’s top-down approach to innovation, it should work with allies to use market incentives to make U.S.- and Western-developed 5G infrastructure and products more competitive. Furthermore, the U.S. military needs to anticipate that its use of native telecommunications infrastructure in a future operating environment may be compromised, limited, or denied. The U.S. military will inevitably need greater bandwidth on the tactical edge and this should be an imperative that drives investment in research and development to address this challenge.

Technological innovation was at the crux of the United States’ comparative military and economic advantage in the twentieth century. In this contemporary great power competition, U.S. failure to innovate at the scientific and technological frontier will have direct (and deleterious) effects for the United States on the distribution of power in the international system over the long term.

#### Chinese tech superiority upends deterrence and emboldens them to risk conflict over Taiwan---extinction.

Kroenig 18, Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University (Matthew, Nov 12, 2018, “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” *BAS*, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war>)

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states.

These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

#### Emergence of smart cities depends on IoT applications of 5G interoperability standards---absent FRAND, excessive royalties will undermine sustainable development.

Schwartz 18, \*Matt Schwartz, Privacy Fellowship Coordinator at ACT, App Association; (March 2nd, 2018, “It’s Smart to be FRANDly: How the FRAND Commitment Will Determine the Future of Smart Cities”, https://actonline.org/2018/03/02/its-smart-to-be-frandly-how-the-frand-commitment-will-determine-the-future-of-smart-cities/)

In December, we [outlined](https://actonline.org/2017/12/18/smart-cities-connecting-your-community-through-technology/%5d) the emergence of Smart Cities – cities that harness technological innovations like internet of things (IoT) devices and data analytics to improve essential infrastructure in growing urban centers. The technological foundation of Smart Cities aims to improve public safety, better allocate resources, and meet the needs of citizens more quickly.

A central element to Smart Cities is the comprehensive network of sensors and devices implemented within buildings, roads, traffic signs, and parking meters that allows them to interact with public, and potentially private-owned, infrastructure. These sensors will “speak” to one another, communicating information about energy usage, traffic density, or other elements of city management that have traditionally either been analyzed separately or not tracked at all. The potential of Smart Cities allows data to flow from previously disconnected branches of the city and be processed in real-time, unlocking previously unknown insights.

The powerful interoperability of Smart Cities will rely heavily on standardized technologies developed in organizations like the IEEE, which is responsible for standardizing the wi-fi technology we use every day. Standardized technologies often include standard-essential patents (SEPs), which, like their name suggests, are patents declared essential to an industry standard by a standards-setting organization. In simple terms, one cannot implement the standardized technology without using the patent.

Like regular patents, the users of SEPs must pay royalties or licensing fees to the patent owner before they may use it. For example, if a manufacturing company wants to make an IoT device interoperable with a 5G network, the manufacturer must pay a licensing fee to the owner of the SEP that is essential to the 5G standard. SEPs play a vital role in the new innovations we enjoy and have come to expect, and because of the value of these patents, SEP holders have the ability to demand high license fees from those who wish to implement the standard. To offset this competition issue, many SEP holders voluntarily agree to license their SEPs to any willing licensee under fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms.

While wi-fi and LTE are standards that will be vital to Smart City deployment, countless new standardized technologies are being developed that will be integral to any fully-operational Smart City. With reasonable access to SEPs, assured by the FRAND commitment, innovators can enjoy the legal and business certainty they need to compete. While the meaning of the FRAND commitment continues to be refined – as evidenced by the development of SEP best practices recently launched by the App Association in Europe – its foundations are well-established.

But what happens when SEP holders do not abide by the FRAND licensing commitment, or simply refuse to license at all? Sadly, small and medium-sized companies would be forced to accept untenable licensing terms, but more realistically, they would be priced out of using the standard altogether. As a result, it would impose a barrier to innovation that would result in fewer products offered to consumers or cities eager to implement IoT technologies. For example, many hope the rise of autonomous vehicles will be seamlessly integrated into the Smart City network. But how beneficial would it be if only some autonomous vehicle brands are able to license the technology needed to communicate with traffic lights, simply because of the market power of a chipmaker? The FRAND commitment is an important backstop to that unfortunate possibility.

It is vital for SEP holders to honor FRAND licensing terms, if not for small and medium-sized innovators, then for the sustainability of future Smart Cities. FRAND creates a platform for innovation, providing a floor on which companies can stand, innovate, and compete. If the foundation of the FRAND commitment is reneged, American innovators pay a steep price – not only do they lose a key component of product development and market entry, but they are also left with years of expensive negotiations and litigation if they choose to challenge the licensing practice. What’s more, the confidence developed in the open standards development system is shaken, and Smart Cities have fewer choices in IoT solutions for their future.

To achieve the promise of Smart Cities, a balanced standards ecosystem is essential. We must allow small and medium-sized developers to leverage industry standards for innovation and prevent cost-prohibitive royalty structures and negotiating practices that are detrimental to competition, while also ensuring that SEP owners can protect their intellectual property and be fairly compensated for its use. The FRAND commitment continues to be the best framework to achieve this balance, and adherence to its principles will determine the future and success of Smart Cities.

#### Climate change is anthropogenic and causes extinction---5G-enabled smart cities are critical for mitigation and adaptation.

Huseien 21, \*Ghasan Fahim Huseien is a research fellow at Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; Dr. Kwok Wei Shah is presently an assistant professor and deputy program director with the Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; (August 23rd, 2021, “Potential Applications of 5G Network Technology for Climate Change Control: A Scoping Review of Singapore”, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/17/9720)

Currently, the entire planet is at risk due to continual climate change [1–3]. The recorded increase in average temperature across the world in the past hundred years, and the associated changes attributed to this, are known as global warming. Many scientists are convinced by the published evidence that this change is anthropogenic and resulted from the elevated emission levels of global greenhouse gases (GHGs) [4,5]. Gases such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone are responsible for the absorption and emission of thermal radiation. These changes in the relative quantities of the GHGs induce a proportional change in the amount of preserved solar energy. Presently, the accepted indicator for global warming is the sustained rise in the mean temperature worldwide. This definition is designed to account for the fact that there may be some localized exceptions to this rise. For example, there may be cooling experienced in a region while the global temperature may increase altogether, hence the need for average temperature. A key concern with the GHGs trapping of more heat in the atmosphere is that it affects both climate and short scale weather patterns. Consequently, it results in greater numbers of adverse weather events such as storms, heat waves, cold snaps, droughts, and fires [6]. Climate-related risks to health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, human safety, and economic growth are projected to increase with global warming of 1.5 ◦C [7] and further increase further at 2 ◦C, as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the risks to global aggregated economic growth due to the climate change impacts are projected to be lower at 1.5 ◦C than at 2 ◦C by the end of this century.

Carbon dioxide has the most substantial effect on global warming [8]. Although it was once assumed to have an ~100 year lifespan in the atmosphere, careful studies revealed that the situation is far worse, with three-quarters of the gas expected to remain for a time in the region of up to ~1000 years, with the remainder lasting for an indefinite period of time [9]. It was indicated that the present impacts of humanity on the atmosphere can certainly cause a long term problem [10]. Carbon dioxide is released when oil, coal, and other fossil fuels are burnt for the energy we use to power our homes, cars, and smartphones. By lessening its usage, we can curb our own contribution to climate change while saving money. The first challenge is eliminating the burning of coal, oil, and, eventually, natural gas. Oil is the lubricant of the global economy as it is hidden inside such ubiquitous items as plastic and corn, fundamental to the transportation of both consumers and goods. Coal is the substrate, supplying roughly half of the electricity worldwide, a percentage that is likely to grow according to the International Energy Agency (IEA). In fact, buildings contribute up to 43% of all the greenhouse gas emissions worldwide [11], even though investing in thicker insulation and other cost-effective as well as temperature-regulating strategies can save money in the long run. Investment in new infrastructures, or radical upgradation of the existing highways and transmission lines, may help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yielding economic growth in the developing countries.

Nations across the globe have kept very high targets to reducing their GHG discharges [12,13]. In order to meet these goals, considerable reductions in city energy usage is required. At a global scale, urban communities represent over half (55%) of the population, which is predicted to reach 68% by the middle of this century [14]. Urban areas claim ownership of the highest levels of energy use, gas emission, and also the largest local economy. As such, it is crucial for urban areas to reduce their consumption and utilize renewable sources wherever available to reduce their gas discharge levels. Smart cities often utilize digital sensors to measure and transmit data about the levels of GHGs in the city at that moment, as a means of tackling them [15]. The efficacy of such a system is thus reliant on the network used to collate and analyze the data collected as an extant network. The mobile telecommunications networks offer a convenient solution to this desire, as their pre-existence has the clear benefit of reducing costs compared to the design and implementation of a novel system. It is recognized that smart cities will certainly act as the key players meeting these ambitious targets [16,17]. In this study, we focused primarily on the potential applications of 5G network technology to control climate change in Singapore. In addition, a clear overview of the sustainability benefits of introducing 5G technology compatible smart cities, buildings, and farms in all aspects of urbanization is provided. Herein, the main purpose is to tackle the negative outcomes associated with anthropogenic climate change, with a particular focus on the contributions that are best made by the telecoms network operators.

Climate change is one of the most challenging problems that humanity has ever faced. Presently, hundreds of millions of lives, innumerable species, entire ecosystems, health, economy, and the future habitability of this planet are at risk. Fortunately, climate change is solvable, we just need to wisely exploit the existing technologies and sciences. Climate change mitigation is a pressing international need in which many management actions are required. The development of 5G technology has been largely driven by smart mobile devices and advanced communication technologies. It may thus serve as a technical enabler for a whole new range of business opportunities, energy, and facilities management, together with industrial applications. Moreover, it may enable different devices to work together seamlessly. Definitely, the 5G cellular network technology is expected to revolutionize the global industries with profound effects on the savings of energy, waste generation and recycling, and water resources management, thus reducing the climate change impacts.

### 1AC---Cybersecurity ADV

#### Advantage 2 is Cybersecurity:

#### Aggressive patent strategies create structural flaws in 5G standardization that imperils domestic cybersecurity---market competition reduces the incidence of vulnerability and severity of attacks.

Duan 20, \*Charles Duan is a senior fellow and associate director of tech & innovation policy at the R Street Institute, where he focuses his research on intellectual property issues; (2020, “OF MONOPOLIES AND MONOCULTURES: THE INTERSECTION OF PATENTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY”, Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, 36(4), 369-405. Retrieved from <https://www2.lib.ku.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/monopolies-monocultures-intersection-patents/docview/2442966690/se-2?accountid=14556>)

III. COMPETITION AND CYBERSECURITY

In addition to the historical review done so far, another approach to understanding the relationship among patents, competition, and national security is to consider the role of cybersecurity. There is little doubt that computer system vulnerabilities that enable hacking and spread of computer exploits are a threat to the nation’s defenses, so better cybersecurity is a key part of national security strategy.155

Strong competition can thus complement national security by enhancing domestic cybersecurity, and patent assertion that unduly weakens competition detracts from cybersecurity.156 Competition promotes better cybersecurity in at least two ways. First, multiple studies show that competition encourages firms to improve their products on multiple vectors including cybersecurity. Second, competition avoids a situation that security experts call a “monoculture,” which increases vulnerability to severe cyberattacks. As former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff wrote recently, “We need competition and multiple providers, not a potentially vulnerable technological monoculture,” to guarantee national security.157 Thus, cybersecurity provides a useful lens for understanding how unfettered patent assertion and licensing can detract from national security.

A. Cybersecurity as Competitive Value-Add

Competition enhances national security by reducing the incidence of technical vulnerabilities. That effect is especially important for security sensitive systems such as mobile telecommunications.

Intuitively, a causal chain from competition to cybersecurity makes logical sense. Computer security is a value-added benefit to consumers, so firms in competitive markets are likely to use security to gain an edge over their competitors.158 In monopolized markets, though, there may be less external impetus to test products for flaws, and the monopolist may choose to focus less on security and more on new product features or increased product quality.

Economic research confirms these hypotheses about competition leading to better cybersecurity. A 2009 empirical study of web browsers considered the impact of market concentration on the amount of time that vendors took to fix security vulnerabilities as they were discovered.159 The study found that the presence of more competitors correlated with faster cybersecurity response—a reduction of 8–10 days in response time per additional market rival.160 Similarly, business researchers in 2005 modeled incentives for firms to engage in sharing of cybersecurity information, and concluded that the “inclination to share information and invest in security technologies increases as the degree of competitiveness in an industry increases.”161 Another study found that, where two software firms are in competition, at least one will be willing to take on some degree of risk and responsibility for cybersecurity, whereas a monopoly software firm will consistently fail to accept such responsibility.162 To be sure, an unpublished study from 2017 found that some market concentration can make firms more responsive to cybersecurity issues, but only to a point: “being in a dominant position reduces the positive effect of having less competitors on the responsiveness of the vendor,” and indeed the “more dominant the firm is, the less rapid it is in releasing security patches.”163 This research confirms that competition is more conducive to cybersecurity.

It is not hard to see how this applies to emerging communication technologies markets. In the absence of competition, the above research suggests that device manufacturers, chip makers, and software developers will lack incentives to respond to vulnerabilities, to share information about cybersecurity practices and issues, and to take responsibility for security matters. Mobile phone chips have had their share of cybersecurity failures already.164 The best way to flush out ongoing and future cybersecurity issues is to maintain competitive pressure at all levels of the supply chain.

B. Vulnerabilities of “Monocultures”

A second reason why monopoly undermines cybersecurity is that monopoly leads to a “monoculture” of single-vendor products, opening the door to massive systemic failure in the case of a cyberattack. Computer researchers developed the theory of software monocultures in the early 2000s, in response to the regular phenomenon of computer viruses and other attacks spreading rapidly by exploiting flaws in the dominant operating system at the time, Microsoft Windows.165 Where a computer system such as Windows has a commanding share of users, a virus that exploits a flaw in that system can quickly spread to infect a whole interconnected ecosystem. An operating system monopoly thus enables fast and easy spread of cyberattacks, and better cybersecurity would be achieved through greater diversity in online systems.166 As one research group posited, “a network architecture that supports a collection of heterogeneous network elements for the same functional capability offers a greater possibility of surviving security attacks as compared to homogeneous networks.”167

There has been considerable study of the theory that computer monocultures are naturally more vulnerable to attacks.168 In one study, computer science researchers reviewed a catalog of 6,340 software vulnerabilities recorded in 2007, to compare whether comparable software would share the same flaws.169 Of the 2,627 vulnerabilities applicable to application software (as opposed to operating systems, web scripts, and other software components), only 29 (1.1%) applied to substitute products from different vendors but providing the same functionality.170 By contrast, different versions of a single software product were found to share vulnerabilities 84.7% of the time.171 Thus, software monocultures share exploitable flaws even when there is some variation in versions across the monoculture; by contrast, diversity in software is almost guaranteed to prevent a single flaw from affecting all users.

In the case of 5G and wireless mobile communications, a monoculture is an especially concerning possibility. To the extent that systems such as smart city sensors or communication networks are widely deployed in a monoculture fashion, a widespread attack could have devastating consequences, potentially blacking out a region and affecting essential services such as 911.172 A monoculture that is vulnerable to so-called “rootkits” or “backdoors”—maliciously installed software that enable bad actors to commandeer systems—could also enable mass surveillance or spying by private hackers or foreign governments.173 The presence of systems from multiple vendors would mitigate these possibilities.

#### Actors have the means and motivations to strike critical infrastructure.

Wintch 21, \*Timothy M. Wintch, an active-duty Major in the United States Air Force. He is currently a graduate student at the Oettinger School of Science & Technology Intelligence, National Intelligence University, in Bethesda, Maryland. Mr. Wintch has over 11 years of experience in command-and-control operations as an Air Battle Manager. He holds a Bachelor of Arts in Politics from the University of California, Santa Cruz, and a Master of Arts in Military Studies from American Military University. (April 20th, 2021, “PERSPECTIVE: Cyber and Physical Threats to the U.S. Power Grid and Keeping the Lights on”, https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/)

Among critical infrastructure sectors in the U.S., energy is perhaps the most crucial of the 16 sectors defined by the Department of Homeland Security. This sector is so vital because it provides the energy necessary to run every other critical infrastructure sector. However, the U.S. power grid, the backbone of the energy sector, is built upon an aging skeleton that is becoming increasingly vulnerable every day. Whether from terrorists or nation-states like Russia and China, the power grid is susceptible to not just physical attacks, but also to cyber intrusion as well. However, much of this threat can be mitigated if the U.S. takes the appropriate steps to safeguard the power grid and avoid a potential catastrophe in the future.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, terrorism on U.S. soil has been at the forefront of American consciousness. Critical infrastructure provides an appealing target because of the disproportionally large impact even a small attack can have on the sectors. In particular, the power grid represents a particularly lucrative target, both in terms of the ease of access and the large impact it can make. The National Research Council stated that the U.S. power grid is “vulnerable to intelligent multi-site attacks by knowledgeable attackers intent on causing maximum physical damage to key components on a wide geographical scale.”[[1]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn1) Additionally, the physical security of transmission and distribution systems is difficult due to the dispersed nature of these key components, which in turn is advantageous to attackers as it reduces the likelihood of their capture.[[2]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn2) From 2002-2012, approximately 2,500 physical attacks occurred against transmission lines and towers worldwide and approximately 500 attacks against transformer substations.[[3]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn3) Terrorists have the motivation to attack the U.S. power grid but the very nature of the grid makes it highly vulnerable. The power grid is not only at risk from physical attacks, but also nation-state cyberattacks.

One nation that has shown both the capability and intent to use attacks against critical energy infrastructure is Russia, as demonstrated in their 2015 annexation of Crimea from Ukraine. A Russian cyber threat group known as Sandworm, which used its BlackEnergy malware, attacked Ukrainian computer systems that provide remote control of the Ukraine power grid.[[4]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn4) This attack, and another in 2016, each left the capital Kiev without power, prompting cyber experts to raise concern about the same malware already existing in NATO and the U.S. power grids.[[5]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn5) In any conflict between Russia and NATO, not only would similar cyberattacks pose a threat, but so would potential physical attacks severing fuel oil and natural gas lines to Western Europe. Russia has both the capability and intent to attack critical infrastructure, particularly power grids, during future conflicts in their “hybrid warfare” approach.

Another nation that has the capability to attack critical energy infrastructure is China, representing a threat to not just the U.S. energy infrastructure but also that of our allies whose support would be vital in a major conflict. A recent NATO report highlighted this threat from China’s Belt and Road Initiative, stating that “[China’s] foreign direct investment in strategic sectors [such as energy generation and distribution] …raises questions about whether access and control over such infrastructure can be maintained, particularly in crisis when it would be required to support the military.”[[6]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn6) Like Russia, China has been active with cyber intrusions in U.S. energy infrastructure. The Mission Support Center at Idaho National Laboratory characterized these as attacks as “multiple intrusions into US ICS/SCADA [Industrial Control Systems/Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition] and smart grid tools [that] may be aimed more at intellectual property theft and gathering intelligence to bolster their own infrastructure, but it is likely that they are also using these intrusions to develop capabilities to attack the [bulk electric system], as well.”[[7]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn7) China, therefore, has both the capability and intent to conduct cyber intrusions and attacks for myriad reasons.

Another arm of this threat is the reliance the U.S. energy industry has on imports from China, especially transformers. In early 2020, federal officials seized a transformer in the port of Houston that had been imported by the Jiangsu Huapeng Transformer Company before sending it to Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque. Sandia is contracted by the U.S. Department of Energy for mitigating national security threats.[[8]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn8) The Wall Street Journal reported that “Mike Howard, chief executive of the Electric Power Research Institute, a utility-funded technical organization, said that the diversion of a huge, expensive transformer is so unusual – in his experience, unprecedented – that it suggests officials had significant security concerns.”[[9]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn9) Previously destined for the Washington Area Power Administration’s Ault, Colo., substation, the transformer is believed to have been seized due to “backdoor” exploitable hardware emplaced by the Chinese prior to shipment.[[10]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn10) Shortly after these events, President Trump issued Executive Order 13920, “[Securing the United States Bulk-Power System](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-securing-united-states-bulk-power-system/),” essentially limiting the import of Chinese-built critical energy infrastructure components due to concerns about cybersecurity.[[11]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn11) Interestingly, Jiangsu Huapeng “boasted that it supported 10 percent of New York City’s electricity load.”[[12]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn12)

Franklin Kramer, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, testified before a U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Commerce subcommittee during an energy and power hearing in 2011 and said that a “highly-coordinated and structured cyber, physical, or blended attack on the bulk power system, however, could result in long-term (irreparable) damage to key system components in multiple simultaneous or near-simultaneous strikes.” He added that “an outage could result with the potential to affect a wide geographic area and cause large population centers to lose power for extended periods.”[[13]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn13) Even the inclusion of features such as smart grids to the overall grid structure poses new vulnerabilities through their connectivity. Kramer stated that “such connectivity means that the distribution system could be a key vector for a national security attack on the grid.”[[14]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn14)

#### Those attacks cause accidental nuclear escalation.

Klare 19, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation)

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.[12](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12) The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.[13](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12)

The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”[14](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote14)

These are by no means the only pathways to escalation resulting from the offensive use of cyberweapons. Others include efforts by third parties, such as proxy states or terrorist organizations, to provoke a global nuclear crisis by causing early-warning systems to generate false readings (“spoofing”) of missile launches. Yet, they do provide a clear indication of the severity of the threat. As states’ reliance on cyberspace grows and cyberweapons become more powerful, the dangers of unintended or accidental escalation can only grow more severe.

#### Cyber-compromised NC3 causes nuclear war.

Klare 19, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>)

The Nuclear-Cyber Connection

These links exist because the NC3 systems of the United States and other nuclear-armed states are heavily dependent on computers and other digital processors for virtually every aspect of their operation and because those systems are highly vulnerable to cyberattack. Every nuclear force is composed, most basically, of weapons, early-warning radars, launch facilities, and the top officials, usually presidents or prime ministers, empowered to initiate a nuclear exchange. Connecting them all, however, is an extended network of communications and data-processing systems, all reliant on cyberspace. Warning systems, ground- and space-based, must constantly watch for and analyze possible enemy missile launches. Data on actual threats must rapidly be communicated to decision-makers, who must then weigh possible responses and communicate chosen outcomes to launch facilities, which in turn must provide attack vectors to delivery systems. All of this involves operations in cyberspace, and it is in this domain that great power rivals seek vulnerabilities to exploit in a constant struggle for advantage.

The use of cyberspace to gain an advantage over adversaries takes many forms and is not always aimed at nuclear systems. China has been accused of engaging in widespread cyberespionage to steal technical secrets from U.S. firms for economic and military advantages. Russia has been accused, most extensively in the Robert Mueller report, of exploiting cyberspace to interfere in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Nonstate actors, including terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and the Islamic State group, have used the internet for recruiting combatants and spreading fear. Criminal groups, including some thought to be allied with state actors, such as North Korea, have used cyberspace to extort money from banks, municipalities, and individuals.[4](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote04) Attacks such as these occupy most of the time and attention of civilian and military cybersecurity organizations that attempt to thwart such attacks. Yet for those who worry about strategic stability and the risks of nuclear escalation, it is the threat of cyberattacks on NC3 systems that provokes the greatest concern.

This concern stems from the fact that, despite the immense effort devoted to protecting NC3 systems from cyberattack, no enterprise that relies so extensively on computers and cyberspace can be made 100 percent invulnerable to attack. This is so because such systems employ many devices and operating systems of various origins and vintages, most incorporating numerous software updates and “patches” over time, offering multiple vectors for attack. Electronic components can also be modified by hostile actors during production, transit, or insertion; and the whole system itself is dependent to a considerable degree on the electrical grid, which itself is vulnerable to cyberattack and is far less protected. Experienced “cyberwarriors” of every major power have been working for years to probe for weaknesses in these systems and in many cases have devised cyberweapons, typically, malicious software (malware) and computer viruses, to exploit those weaknesses for military advantage.[5](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote05)

Although activity in cyberspace is much more difficult to detect and track than conventional military operations, enough information has become public to indicate that the major nuclear powers, notably China, Russia, and the United States, along with such secondary powers as Iran and North Korea, have established extensive cyberwarfare capabilities and engage in offensive cyberoperations on a regular basis, often aimed at critical military infrastructure. “Cyberspace is a contested environment where we are in constant contact with adversaries,” General Paul M. Nakasone, commander of the U.S. Cyber Command (Cybercom), told the Senate Armed Services Committee in February 2019. “We see near-peer competitors [China and Russia] conducting sustained campaigns below the level of armed conflict to erode American strength and gain strategic advantage.”

Although eager to speak of adversary threats to U.S. interests, Nakasone was noticeably but not surprisingly reluctant to say much about U.S. offensive operations in cyberspace. He acknowledged, however, that Cybercom took such action to disrupt possible Russian interference in the 2018 midterm elections. “We created a persistent presence in cyberspace to monitor adversary actions and crafted tools and tactics to frustrate their efforts,” he testified in February. According to press accounts, this included a cyberattack aimed at paralyzing the Internet Research Agency, a “troll farm” in St. Petersburg said to have been deeply involved in generating disruptive propaganda during the 2016 presidential elections.[6](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote06)

Other press investigations have disclosed two other offensive operations undertaken by the United States. One called “Olympic Games” was intended to disrupt Iran’s drive to increase its uranium-enrichment capacity by sabotaging the centrifuges used in the process by infecting them with the so-called Stuxnet virus. Another left of launch effort was intended to cause malfunctions in North Korean missile tests.[7](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote07) Although not aimed at either of the U.S. principal nuclear adversaries, those two attacks demonstrated a willingness and capacity to conduct cyberattacks on the nuclear infrastructure of other states.

Efforts by strategic rivals of the United States to infiltrate and eventually degrade U.S. nuclear infrastructure are far less documented but thought to be no less prevalent. Russia, for example, is believed to have planted malware in the U.S. electrical utility grid, possibly with the intent of cutting off the flow of electricity to critical NC3 facilities in the event of a major crisis.[8](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote08) Indeed, every major power, including the United States, is believed to have crafted cyberweapons aimed at critical NC3 components and to have implanted malware in enemy systems for potential use in some future confrontation.

Pathways to Escalation

Knowing that the NC3 systems of the major powers are constantly being probed for weaknesses and probably infested with malware designed to be activated in a crisis, what does this say about the risks of escalation from a nonkinetic battle, that is, one fought without traditional weaponry, to a kinetic one, at first using conventional weapons and then, potentially, nuclear ones? None of this can be predicted in advance, but those analysts who have studied the subject worry about the emergence of dangerous new pathways for escalation. Indeed, several such scenarios have been identified.[9](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote09)

The first and possibly most dangerous path to escalation would arise from the early use of cyberweapons in a great power crisis to ~~paralyze~~ undermine the vital command, control, and communications capabilities of an adversary, many of which serve nuclear and conventional forces. In the “fog of war” that would naturally ensue from such an encounter, the recipient of such an attack might fear more punishing follow-up kinetic attacks, possibly including the use of nuclear weapons, and, fearing the loss of its own arsenal, launch its weapons immediately. This might occur, for example, in a confrontation between NATO and Russian forces in east and central Europe or between U.S. and Chinese forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

Speaking of a possible confrontation in Europe, for example, James N. Miller Jr. and Richard Fontaine wrote that “both sides would have overwhelming incentives to go early with offensive cyber and counter-space capabilities to negate the other side’s military capabilities or advantages.” If these early attacks succeeded, “it could result in huge military and coercive advantage for the attacker.” This might induce the recipient of such attacks to back down, affording its rival a major victory at very low cost. Alternatively, however, the recipient might view the attacks on its critical command, control, and communications infrastructure as the prelude to a full-scale attack aimed at neutralizing its nuclear capabilities and choose to strike first. “It is worth considering,” Miller and Fontaine concluded, “how even a very limited attack or incident could set both sides on a slippery slope to rapid escalation.”[10](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote10)

What makes the insertion of latent malware in an adversary’s NC3 systems so dangerous is that it may not even need to be activated to increase the risk of nuclear escalation. If a nuclear-armed state comes to believe that its critical systems are infested with enemy malware, its leaders might not trust the information provided by its early-warning systems in a crisis and might misconstrue the nature of an enemy attack, leading them to overreact and possibly launch their nuclear weapons out of fear they are at risk of a preemptive strike.

“The uncertainty caused by the unique character of a cyber threat could jeopardize the credibility of the nuclear deterrent and undermine strategic stability in ways that advances in nuclear and conventional weapons do not,” Page O. Stoutland and Samantha Pitts-Kiefer wrote in 2018 paper for the Nuclear Threat Initiative. “[T]he introduction of a flaw or malicious code into nuclear weapons through the supply chain that compromises the effectiveness of those weapons could lead to a lack of confidence in the nuclear deterrent,” undermining strategic stability.[11](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote11) Without confidence in the reliability of its nuclear weapons infrastructure, a nuclear-armed state may misinterpret confusing signals from its early-warning systems and, fearing the worst, launch its own nuclear weapons rather than lose them to an enemy’s first strike. This makes the scenario proffered in the 2018 NPR report, of a nuclear response to an enemy cyberattack, that much more alarming.

### 1AC---Solvency

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase prohibitions on private sector conduct that is more restrictive of competition than reasonably necessary to enable creation of information technology standards.

#### The plan requires SSO’s to administer reasonable action to prohibit ex post opportunism---that strengthens FRAND effectiveness while enabling SEP holders to capture appropriate royalties---which is the best competition-innovation balance.

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

3. Application of the Basic Legal Principles

The antitrust principle is straightforward: industry-wide collaboration through SSOs to establish procompetitive standards is permitted only if it is no more restrictive of competition than reasonably necessary to enable creation of the standards. When standard setting predictably creates technology monopolies that, if unrestrained, will enable anticompetitive ex post opportunism that would otherwise not occur, an SSO that does not take effective measures to pre- vent or minimize such ex post opportunism engages in conduct that is more restrictive of competition than necessary. In that case, the SSO and, in appropriate cases, its members, may well violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

Under this principle, SSO procedures and FRAND rules should be evaluated based on whether they lead to reasonable SEP royalties, using the competitive ex ante licensing standard discussed above, which has been adopted by the courts in patent law. Put differently, FRAND rules should be evaluated based on their ability to prevent SEP holders from obtaining more than the ex ante value of their technology from implementers.

This limitation would not prevent a SEP holder from proﬁting, perhaps greatly, from participating in the SSO and having its patented technology included in the standard. The SEP holder continues to be rewarded for its technology because the inclusion of its technology in the standard can still greatly increase the volume of licensing opportunities available to the SEP holder.

Whether a particular set of FRAND rules are sufficiently effective in preventing ex post opportunism will depend on the particular circumstances. The procedural unfolding of the case will also depend upon the circumstances. As a general matter, the case would probably be structured as an ordinary Rule of Reason case.82

First, the plaintiff would have to demonstrate harm to competition as a result of the collaboration of the SSO’s members, many of which compete with one another. In this case, the harm to competition would stem from the ability of the SEP holder to exercise monopoly power by obtaining royalties in excess of the competitive, ex ante level. The decision to include patented technologies in the standard would be the allegedly unlawful agreement. Notably, the court need not determine what a FRAND royalty is; it would suffice to determine that market power has been created or exercised, and that existing SSO rules and policies were not adequate to prevent the competitive harm. The defendant, which could be the SSO or perhaps one or more SSO members, would win at this point if the plaintiff failed to show harm to competition. If might fail if the standard faces substantial competition and the court concludes that the SEP holder therefore does not have market power or if the SSO’s rules and policies are found to be effective in preventing ex post opportunism, even if the plaintiff or even the court thinks that other rules and policies would be preferable.

Second, if the plaintiff makes the requisite showing of harm to competition, the defendant(s) would then have to show some procompetitive justiﬁcation— in this case, the beneﬁts of the standard. These two initial steps should be straightforward.

Third, if as is likely the defendant is able to show a procompetitive justiﬁcation, the plaintiff would have to show that the SSO could have used available, reasonable alternatives to realize the efficiency beneﬁts with less or none of the competitive harms. The plaintiff might identify reasonable alternatives that would have led to a different standard, based on including unpatented technology in the standard or perhaps involving fewer SEPs or fewer owners of SEPs, which would be less subject to patent holdup. More likely, the plaintiff could suggest alternative SSO rules that would not change the standard, but would reduce the likelihood or extent of ex post opportunism. For example, the plaintiff might suggest more rigorous FRAND-type rules, such as rules that set forth more precise principles on which FRAND royalties are to be determined and the circumstances under which SEP holders might seek injunctions.

Fourth, the burden would then shift to the defendant(s) to show that the beneﬁts of the standard could not have been realized if the SSO had adopted any of the proffered alternatives or that those alternatives were unrealistic.83 The plaintiff would be entitled to judgment if the court concludes that those beneﬁts could have been realized with less competitive harm if the SSO had adopted the standard with different IPR rules or policies.

Our overall sense, based on experience and the empirical literature, is that the extant FRAND rules are generally useful, but tend to be inadequate because they are imprecise and leave unresolved such critical issues as (a) the meaning of a reasonable royalty, even conceptually; (b) the meaning of “non-discriminatory;” (c) to whom licenses must be offered; and (d) under what circumstances may a SEP holder obtain an injunction.84 These imprecise FRAND commitments are therefore not sufficient to adequately prevent ex post opportunism. The recent revisions to IEEE’s FRAND policy represent a signiﬁcant step in the right direction, but even this advance leaves important questions unanswered.85 If FRAND rules are inadequate in these ways, litigation involving extant FRAND rules would likely be resolved only at the ﬁnal, fourth step. The defendant would be able to demonstrate the beneﬁts created by the standard; the plaintiff would be able to demonstrate the creation of market power and that other reasonable and practical rules or policies would ameliorate the problem. The case would thus turn on whether the defendant is able to demonstrate that signiﬁcant beneﬁts associated with standardization could not have been realized if the SSO had adopted those other rules or policies.

The court would have available a variety of possible remedies if the plaintiff prevails. Implementers that paid supracompetitive royalties or were unlawfully excluded in whole or in part from product markets as a result of the inadequate FRAND policies would be entitled to damages and, in some cases, to treble damages.86 If the unlawful SSO conduct is regarded as the collective action of the SSO and its members, which is likely to be the case in most instances, SSO members would be jointly and severally liable for the damages. Forward-looking injunctive relief aimed at restoring competition would need to be fashioned to the requirements of the individual case. For example, a court could order the SSO to adopt a new rule or policy proposed by the plaintiff. If the court is reluctant to take on that governance role, it might give the SSO a period of time—maybe ninety days—to develop a rule, subject to the court’s ultimate approval, which would adequately ameliorate the competitive problem created by the SSO. Alternatively or in addition, the court might order the parties to attempt to negotiate a rule or policy on which they can agree. And, depending on the circumstances, the court might order SEP holders, including at least those that were defendants in the case, to comply with the new SSO rules and policies.

#### Threatening antitrust liability lures SSO’s into adopting best practices.

Lemley & Shapiro 13, \*Mark Lemley is the William H. Neukom Professor at Stanford Law School and a partner at Durie Tangri LLP; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business, University of California at Berkeley and a Senior Consultant at Charles River Associates; (2013, “A SIMPLE APPROACH TO SETTING REASONABLE ROYALTIES FOR STANDARD-ESSENTIAL PATENTS”, (https://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/shapiro/frand.pdf)

Under our approach, many of these issues should become moot, since the patentee cannot obtain an injunction (or transfer the patent to someone who can) against a willing licensee, and since competitors are not involved in jointly setting the reasonable royalty rate. If SSOs set clear, reasonable rules following the best practices we recommend, and parties follow those rules, there should be little or no need for antitrust to intervene. Indeed, even the risk of non-disclosure of a patent is lessened, since the patentee has committed to license its essential patents whether or not it discloses them. For the most part, the rules we have described are self-executing, meaning that even if a party tries to break the rules set by the SSO there still may be no need for antitrust to intervene. Thus, we suggest that parties who abide by these procedures—patentees, implementers, and the SSOs themselves—should be immune from antitrust liability for activities that merely follow those rules.107 They have entered into an arrangement that is on balance good for competition, one that allows patentees to receive reasonable royalties but prevents holdup and reduces the risk of monopolization by trickery.

The fact that antitrust remains a last resort available when SSOs don’t follow best practices may have two practical benefits, however. First, under our approach the promise of avoiding the risk of antitrust liability will be a powerful incentive for both SSOs and patent owners to adopt the best practices we propose. Second, the risk of antitrust liability may be relevant when an individual patentee wants to adopt best practices but the SSO governing the standard has not yet done so. We propose that a patentee that unilaterally commits to the FRAND procedures we describe here should be immune from antitrust liability for following these procedures.108 A patentee’s unilateral binding commitment to arbitration could be enforced whether or not it was elicited by an SSO. Thus, just as the prospect of antitrust immunity might lure SSOs to adopt best practices, it might also lure patentees to implement those practices even if the SSO has not done so. Given the large number of standard-essential patents based on preexisting standards,109 and given that SSOs tend to update their IP rules rather slowly,110 this is not a small matter.

#### Only antitrust enforcement creates a consumer-action feature that counterbalances SSO’s conspiratorial incentives---private action fails.

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf>)

2. Why Antitrust Enforcement Is Necessary

Some SSO members have an interest in ensuring that the SSO takes steps to minimize the potential harms from the SEP holders’ monopoly power, and this undoubtedly explains in part why most SSOs have adopted FRAND policies or similar requirements. But, as shown in the economic model in the Appendix,73 SSOs cannot in general be counted on to adopt effective FRAND policies. The bases for this conclusion, which is central to our argument for the applicability of Section 1 to SSO FRAND rules, can be summarized as follows.74

First, the SSO members collectively have an interest in permitting SEP holders to charge supracompetitive royalties that elevate the downstream price of compliant devices to the monopoly level. Doing so will enable the members in aggregate to collect increased revenues from consumers, and thus to generate increased profits that in theory could be shared by all the members. In other words, supracompetitive royalties can enrich industry participants as a group at the expense of final consumers. This fact alone should serve as a clear and strong signal regarding the dangers of counting on SSOs to implement effective FRAND policies: if the SSO members negotiate efficiently, the outcome will be just as bad for consumers as if the members agreed to fix downstream prices.75 The fundamental problem is that final consumers are not at the table when the SSO rules are negotiated.

Second, SSO members that own SEPs but earn little or no profits as implementers have a powerful self-interest in being able to exercise the ex post monopoly power associated with their SEPs. Because SSO policies are usually determined by a consensus process, these members will likely be able to block the adoption of fully effective FRAND policies. Moreover, these SSO members often have the greatest interest in SSO patent policies. Since much of their income may be attributable to patent licensing, they can be expected to devote substantial resources to block the adoption of FRAND policies that effectively prevent patent holdup.

Third, even SSO members that earn significant profits as implementers may have mixed incentives if they also own SEPs, which can also lead to weak or in-effective FRAND rules. In the Appendix, we show that, if the requisite share of votes in the SSO are cast by firms whose share of SEP royalties is at least as large as their share of downstream profits, and if these firms can coordinate their voting over the FRAND rules, then an SSO unconstrained by antitrust laws will establish FRAND rules leading to an outcome no better for consumers than would result from an integrated monopolist controlling all SEPs and all downstream sales.76

Fourth, even SSO members that are downstream implementers and own few, if any, SEPs may have only a modest interest in promoting effective policies to restrict ex post opportunism. Because all implementers will be subject to the opportunism, all of them will face increased licensing costs, and therefore will likely be able to pass on most or all of the increased costs to their customers.77 Furthermore, these implementers might not be especially active or effective in the standard-setting process for free-riding or public-good reasons, especially if SEP royalties constitute only a relatively small portion of the costs of their standard-implementing products. Public choice theory predicts that the highly motivated SEP holders are likely to have the greatest influence over patent policies.

Empirical evidence bears out these concerns. As a starting point, we find it striking that SSO FRAND rules are almost always quite vague.78 Notably, SSOs in which SEP holders are more prevalent tend to have weaker FRAND rules.79 Further, to our knowledge, SSOs have made almost no effort to enforce their FRAND rules and have, instead, left enforcement efforts to others.80 This evidence raises serious doubts about the effectiveness of the existing FRAND rules in preventing ex post opportunism.

#### Patent holdup is real and necessitates intervention, even if it can’t be systemically proven.

Contreras 19, \*Jorge Contreras, Professor, University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law; (2019, “MUCH ADO ABOUT HOLD-UP”, <https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Contreras.pdf>)

III. CAN WE PLEASE STOP SEARCHING FOR SYSTEMIC HOLD-UP?

It is not the purpose of this article to critique the data or methodologies used by researchers who claim that there is no evidence of systemic hold-up. Though questions remain, the data presented in the cited studies finding no empirical evidence of systemic hold-up present plausible descriptions of current markets for products such as smart phones and other connected technology devices. Instead, this critique is directed at the core assumption that runs through each of these studies: that a lack of evidence of systemic hold-up means that hold-up does not represent a threat that justifies policy intervention. In this Part, I argue that, notwithstanding the findings of these studies, patent hold-up in standardized product markets may indeed be a threat that merits preventative policy measures, but that those measures should be directed toward the prevention of well-understood and actionable forms of anticompetitive conduct rather than the economic phenomenon of hold-up.

A. The Absence of Systemic Hold-Up Does Not Mean that Hold-Up Does Not Occur

In a 2017 article, Galetovic and Haber utilize an extended analogy drawn from the field of Mayan archeology to make the point that scholars sometimes ignore the facts in front of them in order to cling to pre-formed (and empirically unsupported) beliefs.92 In this analogical tradition, I will use a hypothetical from public health epidemiology to illustrate a related point. Let us consider the often fatal and highly contagious viral infection Ebola. U.S. public health officials, aware of the dangerous effects of Ebola, might propose the implementation of prophylactic measures to prevent the spread of Ebola in the United States. Such measures might include early detection systems at U.S. hospitals, a network of Ebola experts ready to investigate suspected cases, and potential vaccines for particularly vulnerable populations. All of these measures, of course, would come at a cost. Those opposing the incurrence of this cost might argue that such measures are unjustified because there is no empirical evidence that Ebola is a problem in the U.S. After all, there are no documented outbreaks of the disease, and the only reported cases have been sporadic and linked to other factors (such as health workers returning from abroad). In fact, both lifespan and overall health in the United States have been improving steadily over the past several decades. Most declines in population health can be traced to causes such as tobacco use, poor dietary choices, lack of exercise and the like, but not to Ebola. Thus, because there is no evidence that Ebola outbreaks have occurred in the United States nor any linkage between decreased health and Ebola, and because the overall health of the United States population continues to improve, there is no justification for preventative measures to stop Ebola outbreaks in the United States.

This reasoning is, of course, fallacious and, in the case of a disease like Ebola, dangerously so. In the field of public health, prophylactic measures are often taken before a health risk affects a significant portion of the population. This is the reason for prophylactic measures in the first place. In the field of public health, it is widely recognized that risks arising from any number of environmental and pathogenic sources can be assessed based on laboratory analysis and test cases, without population-level epidemiological data. In fact, once population level data for such outbreaks is available, it is often too late: an epidemic has broken out and millions are at risk. Luckily, it is doubtful that public health officials would apply the fallacious reasoning outlined above to important public health decisions.

Curiously, however, this “Ebola fallacy” has taken root in the debate over patent hold-up. As discussed above, the purported lack of empirical evidence of system-wide patent hold-up is used as a justification for abandoning or forestalling policy interventions aimed at reducing the risk of hold-up. Because hold-up has not been detected at a systemic level, so the argument goes, it must not be a problem. Therefore, measures designed to prevent hold-up from occurring must be the result of gratuitous or over-zealous policy making. The logical fallacies in this argument should be apparent.

In fact, there are numerous examples of anticompetitive conduct by individual firms in markets that are not otherwise overrun by anticompetitive behavior. For example, in 2009, the Federal Trade Commission brought an action against pharmaceutical manufacturer Solvay and a group of generic drug manufacturers for violating Section 5 of the FTC Act by entering into an arrangement whereby the generic manufacturers agreed not to challenge Solvay’s patent on its AndroGel product and not to market their generic versions of AndroGel, in exchange for a significant payment by Solvay to each of the generic manufacturers (a so-called “pay for delay” scheme).94 The Supreme Court held in 2013 that such conduct was actionable and reversed the Eleventh Circuit’s dismissal of the FTC’s claim.95 Yet even in 2009, the year in which the FTC brought its action, of the 68 agreements settling patent disputes filed by pharmaceutical manufacturers with the FTC,96 the FTC estimated that only 19 of these (28%) were potential pay for delay agreements; and by 2014, the year after the Actavis decision, only 21 out of 160 such agreements (13%) were deemed by the FTC likely to represent illegal pay for delay schemes.97 Thus, while pharmaceutical industry patent settlements have attracted significant attention as potentially anticompetitive arrangements, most such settlements do not merit investigation by the FTC.98

An even more telling example is found in the area of mergers and acquisitions. During fiscal year 2016, a total of 1,832 merger and acquisition transactions were reported to the FTC and DOJ under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act.99 Of these, the FTC challenged only twenty-two (1.2%). 100 Thus, while some anticompetitive mergers may exist, the vast majority are not anticompetitive.101 But the absence of market-wide anticompetitive conduct in the area of mergers and acquisitions hardly excuses the handful of transactions that do present antitrust risks, nor does it suggest that mergers should not be subject to governmental monitoring and, when merited, enforcement.

B. Protective Measures May Already Be Working to Reduce Hold-Up

Another important factor that should be considered regarding the purported lack of empirical evidence of systemic hold-up is the effect that existing policy measures have already had in reducing hold-up. As noted above, the threat of patent hold-up was a primary motivating factor for many SDOs to adopt policies requiring the disclosure and licensing of SEPs. These policies have been in place for decades. In the United States, the first such policy was adopted in 1959 by the American Standards Association (the predecessor to today’s American National Standards Institute (ANSI).102 Today, every one of the more than 200 ANSI-accredited developers of American National Standards must adhere to ANSI’s essential requirements, including the adoption of such a licensing policy for SEPs. Similar policies have existed in European and international standards organizations since at least the 1980s.103 These policies, which were developed by SDOs in large part to reduce the likelihood of hold-up within standard-setting systems, have had several decades to work, and it is likely that the lack of observed hold-up in some studies can be attributed to the successful operation of these policies.

Similarly, antitrust and competition enforcement agencies in the U.S. and Europe have been aware of the potential for hold-up connected with standardization for many years. Accordingly, they have brought enforcement actions when it has been alleged that hold-up behavior has resulted in a violation of the antitrust laws. High-profile enforcement actions against patent holders such as Rambus, 104 Google 105 and Qualcomm106 send powerful deterrent signals to the market and warn others not to engage in similar behavior lest they, too, become the subject of agency enforcement. Like SDO policies, it is likely that the general market awareness of agency interest in standard-setting and hold-up has, to a degree, limited the amount of hold-up that is actually attempted in the marketplace, thereby limiting the direct evidence of hold-up as a systemic problem.

But do the deterrent effects of SDO and agency efforts to reduce hold-up signify that hold-up is not a problem? Certainly not. To reach such a conclusion would be perverse: akin to claiming that burglary is not a problem in a neighborhood that experiences reduced burglary rates after it has implemented an active neighborhood watch program and enhanced policing.

C. Indicia of Healthy Markets do not Prove the Absence of Anticompetitive Conduct

As noted above, one of the principal arguments advanced by commentators seeking to refute the “hold-up theory” is that markets for telecommunications products, namely smart phones, are robust – evidenced by increasing product functionality, decreasing consumer prices and rapid innovation -- and that this degree of robustness indicates that hold-up cannot be a problem in these markets.107 If hold-up were a problem in these markets, they reason, we would see product stagnation, stable (but high) prices, and a lack of competition – features associated with classic examples of hold-up in markets for products such as natural resources and agricultural goods.108

But this argument relies on a false syllogism: hold-up results in market dysfunction; if a market functions well, then it cannot be subject to hold-up. The weaknesses in this argument are multifold. First, hold-up may exist in individual instances without sufficient weight to affect overall market characteristics, particularly in a large global market such as mobile telecommunications. Thus hold-up may exist, even in a market that outwardly appears to be functioning well. Second, there is no valid counterfactual to use to compare the health and robustness of the market for mobile telecommunications products.109 Other consumer electronics devices, such as televisions and DVD players, do not compare well with mobile telecommunications devices, which have taken on a unique character in the modern networked economy. Thus, observing the strength of the market fails to answer the critical questions “compared to what?” and how much stronger the market might be (through more product diversity, functionality, price reduction) without hold-up?

A simple historical illustration is useful in this context. During the decade leading up to the enactment of the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, several major U.S. commodity markets (e.g., steel, salt, petroleum, coal, sugar, lead, and others) came under intense scrutiny for a variety of allegedly anticompetitive industrial arrangements. One might have argued that these markets, had they been subject to the sorts of anticompetitive collusion that the Sherman Act sought to address, should have seen reductions of output and increases in price. Yet, between 1880 and 1890, U.S. output of salt, petroleum, steel, and coal all increased significantly, and prices of steel, sugar and lead all dropped significantly.110 Do these positive market indicia demonstrate that the subject markets were not subject to anticompetitive collusion, and that the Sherman Act was not necessary? Certainly, investigations of these industries revealed significant cartel behavior. I would suggest that few commentators today would argue that the coal, steel, sugar and other major industrial producers of the late nineteenth century were innocent of collusive and anticompetitive conduct, or that the Sherman Act was not a necessary and beneficial measure for the U.S. economy.111 Yet, had we relied solely on the positive characteristics exhibited by these markets as proof that anticompetitive conduct did not exist, then perhaps the Sherman Act never would have been enacted.

By the same token, the fact that global markets for standardized products such as computers and smart phones appear to be thriving does not itself refute the possibility of hold-up nor the existence of anticompetitive conduct in these markets. Nor does it allow regulators and policy makers to drop their guard or cease to monitor these important industries.

## 2AC

### Frand

**US innovation lagging behind China now---5G and 6G**

**Kaur 9-21** (Dashveenjit Kaur is a journalist and senior tech reporter for Tech HQ 9-21-2021, Tech Wire Asia, "Huawei leads China to dominate 6G race against US & Japan", https://techwireasia.com/2021/09/huawei-is-charged-to-have-china-at-the-forefront-of-the-6g-race-against-us-japan/)

Huawei’s plans to develop 6G in China is going well, but will their overseas expansions be challenged by Japan and the US?

About a year ago, on September 15, 2020, the US officially cut off Huawei from all suppliers, whose products contain US technologies, prompting many overseas media to speculate then whether Huawei, which has been reliant upon chip imports, can survive such a ban. Yet, against all odds, Huawei’s business performance exceeded market expectations and the company is even ready to put China at the forefront of 6G wireless technology development.

In fact, in defiance of a US crackdown on the Chinese tech giant, founder, and CEO Ren Zhengfei told employees to “break limits in the sky” and set global standards for the emerging industry. It also signals the company’s resilience despite a year-long US ban. According to a NikkeiAsia report, the Chinese tech giant’s plans to develop 6G also arrives as the US and Japan also push ahead with the next-gen telecom tech.

The report even mentioned an internal company document that states the brand’s intention to continue to develop 5G and Artificial Intelligence businesses while also moving forward in next-generation technology. If there would be any hurdle in their ambitious 6G plans, it would likely come in the form of the US, which has imposed various sanctions in the past that had essentially crippled its once notable smartphone business.

The company reported its largest-ever revenue decline in the first half of 2021, mainly due to its lackluster smartphone business. Although the founder acknowledged the effects of these US trade restrictions, he added that “Our research into 6G is preparation against a rainy day, and we aim to seize the ground of 6G patents. We must not wait until 6G becomes viable, as waiting would impose constraints on us due to a lack of patents.”

Currently, 6G has become a point of competition between major economies. China has prioritized 6G technologies as one of its key research areas for a while now, while the US and Japan are pouring money into 6G development, including its use in satellite technologies — one of America’s strong suits.

Notably, both Japan and the US actually lags behind China in terms of 5G development and deployment.

When the Chinese telecom giant unveiled its 6G plans, it aimed to launch 6G products around 2030. The target was not changed but the barriers to achieving such a goal are becoming more notable. The company’s rotating chairman Eric Xu Zhiju in a recent book preface — which was published on Huawei’s online community Xinsheng — discussed the obstructions.

According to Xu, 6G has a more complicated technology environment than 5G, with the impact likely to come from multiple technologies like cloud computing, blockchain, and big data. He disclosed that Huawei started investment in 6G research in 2017 when it was pushing 5G commercialization.

“Huawei will define 5.5G and research 6G at the same time in the next few years, and it is a test of the whole industry’s imagination and creativity whether 6G can surpass (5G and 5.5G technologies),” Xu wrote.

Inevitably though, the shadow of geopolitical uncertainties hanging over the research and development of 6G technologies may still lead to the exclusion of Huawei from overseas markets in 6G products.

“Whether the industries can achieve satisfying results (in 6G development) around 2030 largely depends on such factors as if the process of defining 6G is open enough, whether the participants are pluralistic, and if the communication is thorough enough,” Xu said. He also noted that Huawei is willing to hold discussions with companies and industries that might need 6G technologies to define 6G jointly.

While the US and China are already fighting for 6G dominance, most of the world is yet to experience the benefits of a 5G network. Analysts have been saying it for a while now — that if political tensions worsen, it’s also possible that 6G will have two sets of standards instead of one which may, in turn, increase the costs of connectivity and bring losses to global companies.

Overall, years of acrimony under the Trump administration have no doubt, hit Chinese technology companies hard, but that hasn’t stopped the country from emerging as the leader in 5G. China has the world’s largest 5G footprint, and — despite multiple attempts by the US to take it on — Huawei towers over rival 5G vendors globally, mostly by offering attractive prices.

#### 3---under-compensation is empirically denied.

Stern 18, \*Richard H. Stern, Professorial Lecturer in Law, The George Washington University Law School. A Washington, D.C. patent and antitrust attorney, Stern was Chief of the Patent Section of the US Justice Department’s Antitrust Division during the Nixon and Ford Administrations; (2018, “Who Should Own the Benefits of Standardization and the Value It Creates?”, https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1439&context=mjlst)

Furthermore, a considerable amount of standardization activity has been coming from groups that prohibit the participating companies or individuals from collecting SEP royalties—so-called “RF-RAND” (royalty-free RAND)435 and “RAND-Zero” (RAND with zero royalties) groups or groups that rely on promises not to assert essential-patent claims436—as well as from SSOs that permit RAND licensing but whose members in practice collect royalties on few, if any, standards.437 The availability of these important, royalty-free technology sources is a factor in evaluating the threatened “disincentivization” and massive resistance against the policies reflected in the IEEE 2015 Patent Policy update.

Finally, the disincentivization argument is pure ipse dixit, for no analysis of comparative rates of return on alternative investment opportunities is offered. Nor is any empirical support provided.438 The rhetoric of “Incentivize me or I’ll defect” is completely unsupported and therefore not credible.

### T Antitrust

#### C/I---Core antitrust laws can be applied to different industries

DoJ 7 (“ANTITRUST DIVISION STATEMENT REGARDING THE RELEASE OF THE ANTITRUST MODERNIZATION COMMISSION REPORT”, Department of Justice Press Release, 4/3/2007, <https://www.justice.gov/archive/atr/public/press_releases/2007/222344.htm> , date accessed 9/4/21)

The AMC has made many specific recommendations in its report, and the Division is in the process of reviewing all of them. The Division commends the AMC for its three primary conclusions:

* Free-market competition should remain the touchstone of United States' economic policy. The Commission's conclusion in this regard is a fundamental starting point for policy makers. Over a century of experience has shown that robust competition among businesses, each striving to be increasingly successful, leads to better quality products and services, lower prices, and higher levels of innovation.
* The core antitrust laws—Sherman Act sections 1 and 2 and Clayton Act section 7—and their application by the courts and federal enforcement agencies are sound and appropriately safeguard the competitiveness of the U.S. economy.
* New or different rules are not needed for industries in which innovation, intellectual property, and technological innovation are central features. Unlike some other areas of the law, the core antitrust laws are general in nature and have been applied to many different industries to protect free-market competition successfully over a long period of time despite changes in the economy and the increasing pace of technological advancement. One of the great benefits of the Sherman and Clayton Acts is their adaptability to new economic conditions without sacrificing their ability to protect competition.

We look forward to reading the report in depth and considering all of the Commission's recommendations. The Antitrust Division appreciates the service and commitment of the AMC Commissioners.

### T Courts

#### Counter-interp---court decisions change the scope of antitrust prohibitions.

Turner 90 (DONALD F. TURNER- was an American antitrust attorney, economist, legal scholar and educator who spent most of his career teaching at Harvard Law School. “The virtues and problems of antitrust law” , The Antitrust Bulletin/Summer 1990, Hein accessed online via KU Libraries , date accessed 9/6/21)

However, unsound interpretations of antitrust laws have adverse economic effects. Court-formulated rules have varied from time to time over the years since antitrust statutes were passed, and the scope of antitrust prohibitions were either enlarged or reduced. While there are extensive disputes as to what the precedents' defects have been and are, it is generally recognized that antitrust law has had and still has some undesirable features that the courts or Congress should correct.

#### Court decisions also change the law.

California Supreme Court 88 (PANELLI-judge. Opinion in Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co., 751 P. 2d 923 - Cal: Supreme Court 1988. Google scholar caselaw, date accessed 9/13/21)

At a less legalistic but more fundamental level, plaintiff argues, with some persuasive force, that prior to Sindell she could not have prevailed on her 1116\*1116 suit. She notes that during the time that defendants argue her action would have been timely, McCreery v. Eli Lilly & Co., supra, 87 Cal. App.3d 77 (overruled by Sindell, supra, 26 Cal.3d 588), effectively barred her claim. In McCreery, the Court of Appeal held that a plaintiff who could not identify the precise manufacturer of the pills ingested by her mother did not allege a cause of action. Plaintiff undoubtedly fell into this group. (6a), (5b) The response to plaintiff's contention is that a change in the law, either by statute or by case law, does not revive claims otherwise barred by the statute of limitations.

#### The term ‘law’ alone includes court decisions.

Olson 18 (OLSON-judge. Opinion in Commonwealth v. Robertson, 186 A. 3d 440 - Pa: Superior Court 2018. Google scholar caselaw, date accessed 9/2/21).

Furthermore, the word "law" is generally regarded as including court decisions. The relevant definition of "law" in Black's Law Dictionary is, "The aggregate of legislation, judicial precedents, and accepted legal principles; the body of authoritative grounds of judicial and administrative action; esp[ecially], the body of rules, standards, and principles that the courts of a particular jurisdiction apply in deciding controversies brought before them[.]" Black's Law Dictionary, 1015 (10th ed. 2014) (emphasis added). Hence, "law" is not only "legislation" but also "judicial precedents." Birchfield was a judicial precedent which was the law of this Commonwealth at the time of Appellee's arrest. Cf. U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2 (the Constitution is the supreme law of our nation). Accordingly, the presumption that an individual is aware of the law includes not just statutory compilations but also judicial decisions. Thus, the trial court erred in finding that Appellee was presumed to believe she was subject to enhanced criminal penalties because of the unconstitutional provision of the Motor Vehicle Code.

### T Core Antitrust Laws

#### w/m-The plan increases the scope of the Sherman Act.

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

Antitrust enforcement aimed only at SEP holders is not sufficient to prevent or remedy ex post opportunism. First, as described in Part I, that kind of enforcement must be implemented separately for each patent holder, and for many standards, there are hundreds or even thousands of SEP holders. Second, some of the most common kinds of opportunism are arguably beyond the reach of antitrust claims against SEP holders. 61 Moreover, enforcement aimed at SEP holders is not directed at the basic problem: the failure of the SSOs to take adequate steps to prevent the ex post opportunism that the SSOs’ conduct enabled. There is, therefore, another important role for Section 1 of the Sherman Act to help guard against ex post opportunism by SEP holders—one that the courts have not yet had occasion to recognize. This role is soundly based on well-established Supreme Court precedent regarding the application of Section 1 to activities by SSOs and their members.

### Reg Neg CP

**“Should” means desirable or recommended, not mandatory.**

**Words and Phrases 2** (“Words and Phrases: Permanent Edition” Vol. 39 Set to Signed. Pub. By Thomson West. P. 372-373)

Or. 1952. Where safety regulation for sawmill industry providing that a two by two inch guard rail should be installed at extreme outer edge of walkways adjacent to sorting tables was immediately preceded by other regulations in which word “shall” instead of “should” was used, and word “should” did not appear to be result of inadvertent use in particular regulation, use of word “should” was intended to convey idea that particular precaution involved was desirable and recommended, but not mandatory. ORS 654.005 et seq. – -Baldassarre v. West Oregon Lumber Co., 239 P.2d 839, 193 Or. 556. – Labor & Emp. 2857

**Doesn’t mean immediate**

**Dictionary.com 10** Dictionary.com, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should

should    /ʃʊd/ Show Spelled[shood] Show IPA –auxiliary verb 1. pt. of shall. 2. (used to express condition): Were he to arrive, I should be pleased. 3. must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency): You should not do that. 4. would (used to make a statement less direct or blunt): I should think you would apologize. Use should in a Sentence See images of should Search should on the Web Origin: ME sholde, OE sc ( e ) olde; see shall —Can be confused:  could, should, would (see usage note at this entry ). —Synonyms 3. See must1 . —Usage note Rules similar to those for choosing between shall and will have long been advanced for should and would, but again the rules have had little effect on usage. In most constructions, would is the auxiliary chosen regardless of the person of the subject: If our allies would support the move, we would abandon any claim to sovereignty. You would be surprised at the complexity of the directions. Because the main function of should in modern American English is to express duty, necessity, etc. ( You should get your flu shot before winter comes ), its use for other purposes, as to form a subjunctive, can produce ambiguity, at least initially: I should get my flu shot if I were you. Furthermore, should seems an affectation to many Americans when used in certain constructions quite common in British English: Had I been informed, I should (American would ) have called immediately. I should (American would ) really prefer a different arrangement. As with shall and will, most educated native speakers of American English do not follow the textbook rule in making a choice between should and would. See also shall. Shall –auxiliary verb, present singular 1st person shall, 2nd shall or ( Archaic ) shalt, 3rd shall, present plural shall; past singular 1st person should, 2nd should or ( Archaic ) shouldst or should·est, 3rd should, past plural should; imperative, infinitive, and participles lacking. 1. plan to, intend to, or expect to: I shall go later.

#### It takes 18 months!

**Siegler 92** (Ellen Siegler is a Senior Attorney in the Office of General Counsel of the American Petroleum Institute. Ms. Siegler was one of API's representatives in the reg-neg developing Clean Air Act regulations to reduce equipment leaks from chemical processes. First, 9-30-1992, Elr, "Regulatory Negotiations: A Practical Perspective", https://elr.info/sites/default/files/articles/22.10647.htm)

Resource Demands. A major disadvantage of the reg-neg process is that it can be extremely resource-intensive and stressful. Creative solutions to complex problems do not come easily to a group composed of representatives of diverse viewpoints. For each moment of inspiration, there are countless moments of turmoil and tedium. This is reflected in the length of time it takes to complete a reg-neg. For example, the first negotiating session of the equipment leaks reg-neg was held in September 1989. Agreement on regulatory language was not announced until 18 months later, and agreement on the preamble language has yet to be achieved. In the interim, there were two-day meetings [22 ELR 10652] approximately every month, with subcommittee meetings to address critical issues. Aside from the meetings, a considerable amount of time was spent collecting data, building consensus positions, and drafting proposals and counterproposals for subsequent meetings.

#### Clarity DA---A broad, unambiguous, transparently enforceable ruling is key---reg neg confuses the plan’s decision, ruining investor certainty and inviting loopholes.

Reed 19, \*Morgan Reed, President of the App Association, represents more than 5,000 app makers and connected device companies in the mobile economy; (March 13th, 2019, “An FTC Settlement with Qualcomm Could Hold the Entire IoT Economy Hostage”, https://actonline.org/2019/03/13/an-ftc-settlement-with-qualcomm-could-hold-the-entire-iot-economy-hostage/)

Any Outcome that Allows Qualcomm to Export its Illegal Behavior to New Markets Would Be Devastating

Qualcomm’s executives are desperate to save their jobs as shareholders fume over the $121 billion offer they rejected, and time is running out to turn the ship around. Qualcomm’s history, and its current desperate situation, mean that FTC cannot take any promises Qualcomm makes at face value, and must ensure any remedies they reach are iron clad and not limited to a few companies or even the broader smartphone industry. Any company willing to argue that the refusal to license patents to competitors is perfectly legal under its FRAND commitments clearly has no qualms about breaking its contracts and legal commitments. With shareholders demanding results immediately, Qualcomm’s executives will be looking for any loophole or gray area they can exploit as long as possible.

Perhaps most importantly, the FTC must ensure any outcome of this case protects competition beyond the smartphone industry.  Any court decision or settlement in this case should be comprehensive (i.e., fully address each charge the FTC has made in its enforcement action), enforceable, and as transparent as possible in order to provide small business innovators with maximum clarity.

As we move toward a 5G connected world, Qualcomm’s practices represent a clear and present danger to the entire economy. We must protect these standards which form the foundation for competition in the connected economy, and that means holding Qualcomm to their FRAND commitments across the board in a way that leaves no room for the gamesmanship it is famous for in this context. Anything less will only serve to encourage Qualcomm to export its anticompetitive behavior to every corner of the economy.

#### Qualcomm backlashes---they’re a powerful lobby that say no to negotation

Frankenfield 20, experienced writer on a wide range of business news topics and his work has been featured on Investopedia and The New York Times among others (Jake, “Which Industry Spends the Most on Lobbying?,” <https://www.investopedia.com/investing/which-industry-spends-most-lobbying-antm-so/>)

In the American political system, lobbying is par for the course. It has come to be expected that major industries, and the leading corporations in those industries, will seek to influence legislation, regulation, and the enforcement of government decisions, such that they receive preferential treatment. This could come in the form of campaign contributions, or actual lobbying, with a lobbyist working on behalf of the corporation that has paid them to influence a particular vote or governmental decision. What it is they are lobbying for, though, is a more involved question. Here, using data from opensecrets.org, we break down lobbying efforts, industry by industry, combining all political contributions and lobbying spending from Jan. 1998 to March 31, 2020. Figures are calculations by the Center for Responsive Politics based on data from the Senate Office of Public Records. Let's take a closer look at how much each industry spends on lobbying, the top corporate spenders in each category, and what spurs their lobbying efforts. KEY TAKEAWAYS Companies and industries in the United States will lobby government officials to influence them to act in ways that benefit the lobby's interests. Lobbyists for corporations or industries might seek to sway officials regarding legislation, regulations, and the enforcement of government decisions. Over the past 22 years, the pharmaceutical and health products industry has spent the most money of all industries in lobbying spending. Other industries that spend heavily on lobbying efforts include insurance, electric utilities, electronics manufacturing, and business associations. Pharmaceuticals/Health Products: $4,450,373,773 Spending $4.45 billion over the past 22 years, the pharmaceutical and health products industry has far outpaced all other industries in lobbying spending. It's important to note that this industry includes not only drug manufacturers, but also the sellers of medical products and nutritional and dietary supplements. From Jan. 2020 through March 2020, spending was topped by the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America and Pfizer Inc. Overall, the industry is primarily concerned with "resisting government-run health care, ensuring a quicker approval process for drugs and products entering the market, and strengthening intellectual property protections.” In recent years, lobbying has focused more specifically “on the patent system, research funding, and Medicare.” As is to be expected, lobbying efforts reached a fever pitch in 2009, around the drafting of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and reported a high in 2017 with legislative enactments again focusing on changes to health care. 1,227 (62.9%) The number of pharmaceutical/health product lobbyists in the United States and the percentage that are former government employees as of March 2020. Insurance: $2,973,247,470 Including health, property, and car insurance companies, along with agents and brokers, the insurance industry has historically been the second most generous/aggressive industry in lobbying for their interests. In 2019, spending was $155.3 million. Following the passage of the ACA and subsequent developments under the Trump administration, health insurance companies have been very involved in the legislative process, looking to influence new regulations. In 2019, the leading insurance industry lobbyist corporation was Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Electric Utilities: $2,567,713,347 The electric utilities industry monitors legislative and regulatory action taken on a number of fronts, including clean air regulation, waste storage, cybersecurity, and infrastructure. The top lobbyist in electric utilities as of March 2020 is Duke Energy. Electronics Manufacturing and Equipment: $2,501,822,021 These are your classic software and hardware computer tech companies, some of the founders of the tech movement that exists today. As this industry has become increasingly profitable, its political contributions have increased. The industry is relatively non-partisan, usually given to each party evenly, with slight favoring to the party in the White House. Given the ubiquity of hardware and software, and tech more generally, it makes sense that lobbying from the electronics sector is varied, with lobbying efforts on homeland security, taxes, copyright, immigration, human rights, cybersecurity, and law enforcement data storage. As of March 2020, the top lobbying spenders were Qualcomm Inc and Microsoft Corp.

#### Companies just won’t listen– it isn’t legally enforced

Provost and Gerber 20 (The Contested Politics of Environmental Rulemaking Colin Provost School of Public Policy/Department of Political Science University College London Brian J. Gerber College of Public Service and Community Solutions Arizona State University <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10103789/3/Provost_Accepted%20Version%20for%20UCL%20RPS%20of%20Contested%20Politics%20of%20Environmental%20Rulemaking%20July%202020.pdf> //ArchanSen)

Weber and Khademian also paint a more mixed picture of reg-neg outcomes (1997). Utilizing an EPA case study on reformulated gasoline from the G.H.W. Bush Administration, they find that reg-neg enhanced the consensual nature of the process and helped make compliance with the final rule more feasible. However, they also highlight that the dispute resolution techniques embedded in the reg-neg process may represent a subtle form of political control entrenchment of economic interests at the expense of consumer priorities—a concern also shared by Funk (1997). Weber and Khademian also argue that a lack of credible commitment can torpedo reg-neg rules, as they can be legally challenged after publication and there are no formal mechanisms for preventing Congress or the President from interfering in the process. The doubts about reg-neg’s performance appeared to catch up with it over time, as it largely stopped being used within the EPA by the early 2000s (Lubbers 2008). However, Rinfret and Cook reveal that the EPA is making the most of the consultative elements of reg-neg and consulting with a wide range of groups in a process known as “reg neg lite” or “shuttle diplomacy” (2014).

### States CP

#### Attempts to impose antitrust liability on SSO’s depends on limitations of patent rights

Martino et al. 20, \*[Matthew M. Martino](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/m/martino-matthew-m) [Tara L. Reinhart](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/r/reinhart-tara-l) [Steven C. Sunshine](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/s/sunshine-steven-c) [Julia K. York](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/y/york-julia-k), works with clients at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP; (August 14th, 2020, “Ninth Circuit Strikes Down Sweeping Injunction Against Qualcomm and Reins In Expansive Interpretation of Sherman Act”, https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2020/08/ninth-circuit-strikes-down-sweeping-injunction)

In its highly anticipated decision, the Ninth Circuit panel unanimously rejected the lower court’s reasoning, vacating the judgment and reversing the worldwide injunction against Qualcomm. The panel concluded that the district court had erroneously imposed the antitrust duty to deal on Qualcomm, had impermissibly looked outside the relevant antitrust market in order to infer an anticompetitive act and had relied on outdated evidence of agreements that were terminated before the suit was filed to justify a broad, forward-looking global injunction. The Ninth Circuit further rejected the argument that a SEP holder’s violation of FRAND commitments could independently create antitrust liability, instead pointing to patent and contract law as sources for potential remedies. The decision reflects a considered effort to rei

n in the district court’s expansive interpretation of general antitrust principles and their specific application to SEP holders, as well as recognition that the antitrust laws aim to preserve companies’ incentives to innovate and compete. Recognizing that while “[a]nticompetitive behavior is illegal under federal antitrust law[,]” the panel was adamant that “[h]ypercompetitive behavior is not.”[7](https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2020/08/ninth-circuit-strikes-down-sweeping-injunction" \l "ftn7)

Rejection of District Court’s Expansive Interpretation of Antitrust Laws

The Ninth Circuit decision contains several notable conclusions regarding the scope of Section 2 of the Sherman Act and what constitutes cognizable antitrust harm.

#### That means the patent law preempts state antitrust law

Samp 14, \*Richard A. Samp is the chief counsel for Washington Legal Foundation (WLF), a non-profit, public interest law firm in Washington, D.C. WLF filed an amicus brief in support of Love Terminal Partners. (2014, “The Role of State Antitrust Law in the Aftermath of Actavis”, https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=mjlst)

V. ACTAVIS’S PREEMPTIVE EFFECT

Application of state antitrust law to reverse payment settlements is not merely a hypothetical possibility. There are a fair number of pending lawsuits that challenge reverse payment settlements on state-law grounds. The California Supreme Court has agreed to review one such suit.74 In seeking affirmance of the appeals court’s dismissal of the suit, the defendants argue inter alia that the suit is preempted by federal law.75

As noted above, there is precedent for a finding that state antitrust law is preempted to the extent that it conflicts with the policy underlying a federal statute.76 Moreover, in the context of patent law, federal courts have not hesitated to preempt state laws that the courts deem to stand as an obstacle to accomplishing Congress’s objectives (i.e., encouraging efforts to develop new and useful products).77 To the extent that any portions of Actavis’s holding can be deemed to reflect the Court’s perception of Congress’s new-product-development objectives, a state law is preempted if it is inconsistent with that holding and seeks to impose a greater degree of antitrust liability on the parties to a reverse payment settlement.

Actavis’s treatment of settlements involving a compromise entry date appears to meet that description. Actavis held that federal antitrust liability could not arise from a settlement in which the generic manufacturer agrees not compete for a number of years and in return is rewarded with an exclusive license to market its product several years in advance of the patent’s expiration date.78 Accordingly, states are not permitted to impose antitrust liability under similar circumstances because doing so would upset the balance that, according to Actavis, Congress sought to achieve between antitrust and patent law.

Other issues left open by Actavis are likely to be answered in the years ahead. For example, the Supreme Court did not specify whether noncash benefits received by a generic manufacturer in connection with a patent settlement can ever serve as the basis for federal antitrust liability. If the Supreme Court eventually answers that question by stating: “No, federal antitrust law will not examine settlement benefits other than cash that flow to the infringing party,” then it is likely that state antitrust law would be required to conform to that rule. The potential grounds for such a ruling (a desire both to promote settlement of patent disputes and to uphold reliance interests in existing patents) are based largely on values embedded in federal patent law.

There is little reason to believe, however, that the Court would prevent application of state antitrust law to patent settlement agreements where state law is fully consistent with federal antitrust law. Even in areas subject to extensive federal regulation, the Supreme Court has upheld the authority of states to engage in parallel regulation that is not inconsistent with the federal regulation.79 Unless the Court were to determine, as in Connell,80 that states could not be trusted to properly accommodate the objectives of the federal statute at issue (here, federal patent law), there is no reason to conclude that Congress would not have wanted states to be permitted to police the same sorts of anticompetitive conduct that is policed by federal antitrust law. Moreover, states are likely free to impose greater penalties on the proscribed conduct than is available under federal law. As the Court explained in California v. ARC America Corp., state antitrust law is not required to adhere to the same set of sanctions imposed by federal antitrust law.81

It seems reasonably clear, however, that Actavis prohibits states from adopting the procedural devices rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court—either a per se condemnation of reverse payment settlements or a presumption of illegality accompanied by “quick look” review. The Supreme Court rejected those approaches because it determined that in many cases there might well be pro-competitive economic justifications for reverse payment settlements and that presuming their illegality could result in the suppression of economically useful conduct.82 State antitrust laws that adopted the FTC’s proposed presumption of illegality would be subject to similar criticism, and thus would likely be impliedly preempted as inconsistent with the careful balance between antitrust and patent law established by Actavis.

CONCLUSION

Because Actavis left so many questions unanswered regarding the application of federal antitrust law to patent settlement agreements, the extent to which federal law preempts the application of state antitrust law to such agreements remains similarly unsettled. One can be reasonably confident that if private plaintiffs become dissatisfied with the results of pending litigation under federal antitrust law, they will turn with increasing frequency to state antitrust law as an alternative remedy. Even if state law ends up doing no more than “parallel” federal antitrust law, defendants are likely to incur substantial litigation costs fending off such state claims in the years to come.

### FTC Tradeoff DA

#### Non-unique and link turn---post *Qualcomm*, the FTC will devote more resources to litigation against SEP holders. The plan 1) makes cases these easier to win…

Angela Morris 9/17, litigation reporter at American Lawyer Media, reports on cases pending in the federal circuit, 9/17/2021, “The FTC creates a potential new US headache for SEP owners,” https://www.iam-media.com/frandseps/the-ftc-creates-potential-new-us-headache-sep-owners

SEP owners that may already be wary of potential Biden Administration regulatory changes now have a new threat to keep them up at night.

Over the summer the Federal Trade Commission [announced an expanded view](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-ftc-expands-section-5-enforcement-7020931/) of its standalone enforcement authority to curb anti-competitive misconduct; and [now the agency has made it clear](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2021/09/ftc-streamlines-investigations-in-eight-enforcement-areas) that priority targets include “abuse of intellectual property” and “monopolistic practices”.

The agency’s description of the “anticompetitive and deceptive conduct” it seeks to curtail in the technology sector most likely will encompass alleged misconduct by standards essential patent (SEP) owners and their commitments to licensing on FRAND terms, according to IP and antitrust attorney [Tim Syrett](https://www.wilmerhale.com/en/people/timothy-syrett).

“The FTC has previously conducted two investigations where it found that SEP holders seeking injunctions against licensees was anti-competitive and presented a threat to innovation,” Syrett, who is a partner in Wilmer Hale in Washington DC, explains via email. “That may be an area where the FTC wants to continue to devote resources and is certainly an area where there can be harm to competition because of the hold-up power of SEPs.”

Wilmer Hale has represented Apple in high-profile disputes with Samsung, Nokia and Qualcomm, as well as other Big Tech companies in litigations that concern the intersection of patents and anti-trust.

Syrett adds that investment-backed patent assertion entities and patent aggregation organisations may also have reason to fear ITC investigations.

“Investment-backed patent assertion entities can obscure information about who actually owns or has an interest in patents that can harm both licensing and litigation,” says Syrett. “Further, we have seen a concerning rise of patent assertions where the incentives of investors to obtain outsized returns from patents trump any reasonable valuation of the patents’ worth, which can harm competition in the licensing of patents.”

Many in US patent circles may disagree with Syrett's claims about hold-up and PAEs, but the concern will be that they  represent opinion inside the FTC.

The commission has indicated that it will investigate potential abuses of IP rights that create anti-competitive and deceptive conduct, identifying the pharmaceutical, technology and gasoline refining industries by name. Another stated FTC aim is to target alleged abuses of market power that stop entrepreneurs from competing with Big Tech.

These two resolutions were among a group of eight that a divided commission passed this month on a 3-2 vote, as the agency seeks to handle increased workload from high merger filings. Both resolutions, effective for 10 years, direct the agency to use its compulsory processes to obtain documents and testimony through either demands or subpoenas to investigate allegations that would be a violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act.

Section 5 prohibits business conduct that amounts to an unfair method of competition that impacts commerce. Historically, that has meant a violation of federal antitrust laws like the Sherman Antitrust Act or the Clayton Act. However, over the summer, the FTC issued an expanded interpretation of its Section 5 authority that opened room for the agency to use its standalone authority to bring Section 5 enforcements.

The “abuse of intellectual property” resolution would allow FTC staff quickly to conduct investigations into IP rights as a source of anti-competitive and deceptive conduct in the pharmaceutical, technology and gasoline refining industries, said the commission statement that announced the resolutions on 14 September.

[According to the resolution](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/attachments/press-releases/ftc-streamlines-consumer-protection-competition-investigations-eight-key-enforcement-areas-enable/omnibus_resolutions_p859900.pdf), the agency plans to investigate people, partners or corporations that engage in “unfair, deceptive, anticompetitive, collusive, coercive, predatory, exploitative or exclusionary acts or practices”. The FTC will determine what action to take or remedy to grant, including injunctive or monetary relief that is in the public interest.

Another resolution on “monopolistic practices” addresses bipartisan concerns about market power abuses by tech companies and other large businesses, said the statement. It added that the resolution allows FTC staff to expeditiously investigate dominant players’ abuses that stop other businesses and entrepreneurs from competing – especially in digital markets.

The vote on the resolutions split the commission, with [chair Lina Khan](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1596260/p859900omnibuslmkrksconcur.pdf) and commissioners [Rohit Chopra](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1596280/p859900rcomnibusstmtomnibusmilitary.pdf) and Rebecca Kelly Slaughter in favour, and commissioners [Noah Joshua Phillips and Christine S Wilson](https://www.ftc.gov/public-statements/2021/09/dissenting-statement-commissioners-noah-joshua-phillips-christine-s-wilson) opposed.

Syrett says he can’t predict if the agency’s announcement is a prelude to more *FTC v Qualcomm* style investigations, but he does view it as another signal that the Biden Administration takes a different approach to SEP and FRAND issues compared with its predecessor. It goes hand-in-glove with [the president’s executive order in July](https://www.iam-media.com/frandseps/white-house-executive-order-seps-frand-europe) telling the attorney general and secretary of commerce to reconsider a 2019 statement that downplayed the risk of SEPs.

“The prior administration took a decidedly pro-patent holder view when it came to considering harm to competition from SEPs,” says Syrett. “The Biden Administration has shown that it’s willing to return to the consensus view that’s existed across multiple administrations, both Republican and Democratic, that SEPs pose a significant risk of holdup that can harm competition, innovation and consumers.”

#### Turn---the prospect of antitrust intervention deters violations---that’s Melamed and Shapiro---no enforcement necessary.

Cheng 13, \*Thomas Cheng, B.A. (Yale), J.D. (Harvard), B.C.L. (Oxon); Attorney & Counsellor, New York State; Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, The University of Hong Kong; (2013, “Putting Innovation Incentives Back in the Patent-Antitrust Interface”, <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1195&context=njtip>), ability edited

Imposing a duty to license on opportunistic patentees may solve this problem. If these patentees know that the courts may step in and mandate licensing at a reasonable royalty rate,214 they will be induced to enter into negotiations with follow-on innovators in good faith.215 The threat of compulsory licensing may become a default background legal rule against which negotiations between initial and follow-on innovators take place. The instances in which the courts need to intervene could be few.

#### FTC fails at oil and gas enforcement despite using all resources— their card

Botts ‘9/1/17 [Baker Botts is an international law firm of approximately 700 lawyers practicing throughout a network of 13 offices around the globe. Based on our experience and knowledge of our clients' industries, we are recognized as a leading firm in the technology, energy, and life sciences sectors. "FTC Chair Turns Antitrust Attention to Energy Industry." https://www.bakerbotts.com/thought-leadership/publications/2021/september/ftc-chair-turns-antitrust-attention-to-energy-industry]

For the energy sector, one silver lining of the increasingly aggressive rhetoric from antitrust regulators has been their singular focus on “big tech.” It seemed, for a time, that oil & gas had finally abdicated its long-held position as the industry most likely to be on the receiving end of heightened antitrust scrutiny. Any such hope evaporated last week, when Lina Khan, the new chair of the Federal Trade Commission, sent a letter to the White House, making clear that she has the energy industry squarely within her sights.

This renewed focus on the energy industry comes at an already sensitive time. If gas prices rise in the wake of Ida, there will be loud calls for an investigation, as was the case after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. Similar to those storms, Ida amounted to a direct hit on the industry, barreling through the Gulf Coast and Louisiana, leaving more than 1 million without power. While it remains to be seen what will ultimately happen with fuel prices, there were already calls for an investigation after prices rose through the summer, even before the hurricane was on the horizon.

I. Ms. Khan’s Letter

The letter, sent on August 25, came in response to a request from Brian Deese, Director of the National Economic Council, for the FTC to investigate elevated gas prices. In his August 11 letter, Deese noted, “During this summer driving season, there have been divergences between oil prices and the cost of gasoline at the pump.” He asked the FTC to investigate. Khan’s response went far beyond Deese’s straightforward request, outlining a three-part enforcement plan, tightly focused on the energy industry.

First, Khan stated, she plans to “identify additional legal theories” to challenge retail fuel station mergers “where dominant players are buying up family-run businesses.” This remarkably specific initiative, possibly untethered to traditional concerns about customer impacts, could mean longer and less predictable reviews for deals involving the sale of independent gas stations.

Second, Khan indicated she would be “taking steps to deter unlawful mergers in the oil and gas industry.” While she again made clear that she is focused on retail fuel deals, she clearly left the door open for a broader industry focus. Specifically, Khan referred to a July decision to rescind a prior FTC policy that limited requirements for parties to any merger ultimately deemed unlawful to obtain prior approval from the agency for any future transactions. In her letter from last week, Khan stated: “we will impose ‘prior approval’ requirements to deter those who propose illegal mergers, including in retail gas markets.”

Finally, Khan wrote that she “will be asking our staff to investigate abuses in the franchise market.” She hypothesized that “large national chains” might be forcing their “franchisees to sell gasoline at higher prices, benefitting the chain at the expense of the franchisee’s convenience store operations.” Khan then signed off, stating, “I will continue to assess how the FTC can use its tools to police unlawful business practices in oil and gas markets.”

All of this adds up to a notably focused promise to create new hurdles for proposed transactions in the energy industry and to find new reasons to investigate a variety of conduct.

II. Pricing Investigations

Whether triggered by Hurricane Ida or by letters from concerned officials such as Mr. Deese, any FTC gas pricing investigation would bring significant discovery burdens for industry participants. The post-Katrina report, released in May 2006, explained: “Since August 2005, the Commission has expended substantial resources on this investigation, including the full-time commitment of a significant number of attorneys, economists, financial analysts, paralegals, research analysts, and other support personnel with specialized expertise in the petroleum industry.” Specifically, FTC staff conducted 65 interviews, issued 139 Civil Investigative Demands (similar to subpoenas), and 99 orders seeking profitability and tax expenditure information. Staff identified more than 105 retailers accused of price gouging.

Despite the deep dive, the Commission uncovered very little evidence of wrongdoing. While finding that seven refiners, two wholesalers, and 24 single-location retailers had higher average gasoline prices that were not substantially attributable to higher costs during the relevant period, the report ultimately concluded: “additional analysis…showed that other factors, such as regional or local market trends, appeared to explain the pricing of these firms in nearly all cases.”

This prior failure to find illegal conduct is unlikely to dissuade the current slate of enforcers from pursuing a similar investigation. Aggressive antitrust enforcement has rapidly become a central cause of the current administration. Biden’s antitrust appointees, including Khan, are clearly intent on implementing an elevated level of antitrust scrutiny.

#### No oil volatility

Nick Cunningham, IR MA, 17, columnist for OilPrice.com, 1/2/17, “Here’s Why Oil Price Volatility Could Cool Significantly In 2017,” [http://etfdailynews.com/2017/01/02/heres-why-oil-price-volatility-could-cool-significantly-in-2017](http://etfdailynews.com/2017/01/02/heres-why-oil-price-volatility-could-cool-significantly-in-2017/)

But while large cuts from OPEC are generally very bullish for oil prices, there is a side effect on the oil market from those reductions that could mute the price impact. Taking such a large volume of oil off the market does not make that production capacity go away. Indeed, moving 1.2 mb/d of capacity from active production into idled capacity will provide a substantial buffer to any unforeseen supply disruption.

That has always been the logic behind OPEC’s use of “spare capacity.” Saudi Arabia is pretty much the only country that has a large volume of oil capacity sitting on the sidelines, output that can be ramped up within a few weeks or months. The EIA defines spare capacity as output that can be turned on within 30 days and sustained for at least 90 days. Periods of low oil prices and low price volatility tend to correspond with periods of time in which Saudi Arabia has a large cushion of spare capacity. If the global oil market suffers from a surprise outage – say from a natural disaster like Hurricane Katrina or a man-made disaster like the war in Iraq – then there is capacity that can be called upon to plug any supply deficit.

Saudi Arabia has done this in the past, and because the oil markets are aware that such a capacity exists, volatility tends to be lower than it otherwise would be. When Saudi Arabia ratchets down production, which necessarily creates a larger buffer of spare capacity, volatility tends to soften. The opposite also tends to be true: when the market tightens, and Saudi Arabia ramps up production to meet demand, it does not always lead to lower prices. A smaller spare capacity can spook oil traders, especially when an outage occurs. In the period between 2003 and 2008, when OPEC was producing at elevated levels and running down spare capacity, it corresponded with the largest and longest bull run for oil in recent memory. OPEC’s spare capacity ran below 2 mb/d for most of that period.

All of this is to say that the large cuts in production in 2017, assuming that they do occur, are not entirely bullish for oil prices. Saudi Arabia has promised to cut output from 10.6 mb/d down close to 10.0 mb/d. That will move a slice of active production into latent spare capacity. Add to that the smaller contributions from other OPEC and non-OPEC members, and the global spare capacity is set to grow for the first time in years (aside from a small uptick at the end of 2015).

More spare capacity will provide a bit of buffer to any potential outage in 2017, smoothing out the sharp edge of a hypothetical price spike. “If you’ve got OPEC full adherence for the first six months, the market should be relatively insulated from political risk because that cushion is available,” Alan Gelder, a vice president of Wood Mackenzie Ltd., told Bloomberg in an interview. Only a major outage in Saudi Arabia would be an unfixable problem for the oil market, he says. “[A]nything else should be able to be accommodated.”

That suggests that oil price volatility could be lower in 2017. Volatility is already at its lowest level in a year, which underscores the same argument: volatility plunged following the OPEC deal, as a greater level of certainty spread over the market (see chart: OVX is an index that tracks oil price volatility). And the resulting spare capacity that will result from the OPEC deal could lead to a sustained period of lower volatility. The “managed” market of OPEC has always been more stable than the “free” market in which OPEC jockeyed for market share.

The one other factor to keep an eye on is the near-record level of oil inventories, which will act as a second form of spare capacity – supply that can be called upon in a moment’s notice. That is another reason to believe that volatility will be less of a problem in 2017 than it was in 2016. The flip side of that is that the OPEC cuts will tighten the supply/demand balance, and will likely force drawdowns in inventories over the course of 2017. Once inventories come down to long-run averages, then there will be a smaller buffer for the global oil market. But, again, OPEC should have a little bit more capacity to work with to resolve any unexpected problem. After more than two years of volatility, we could be in for a smoother ride in 2017.

### Court Clog

**Court clog is fearmongering.**

**Stern 03** – J.D. Candidate, 2004, University of Pennsylvania Law School; B.A., 2001, The Johns Hopkins University. (Toby J., “FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEARING THE "FLOODGATES OF LITIGATION," UPenn Journal of Law, 2004, <https://www.law.upenn.edu/journals/conlaw/articles/volume6/issue2/Stern6U.Pa.J.Const.L.377(2003).pdf)>

One of the most easily identifiable problems with the floodgates argument is that it is rarely, if ever, followed by a true analysis of the potential litigation of which it speaks. That is, one response to a floodgates argument might be, "Are you sure that a contrary position would yield a flood of litigation?" 82 This criticism is frequently leveled against the floodgates argument, especially in the realm of tort litigation. For example, as one commentator has argued: The "floodgates of litigation" argument has proven wrong time and again. The lifting of the "impact" rule in rewarding damages for mental anguish, allowing third parties to recover under contracts, and the recognition of the right to privacy, were all prophesied to overwhelm the courts with frivolous claims. **They have not**. This argument, one should think, is relatively strong. While the floodgates argument is generally based on policy considerations,8 5 policy arguments are rarely so indeterminate. While moral arguments are certainly not precise--one cannot quantify, say, "fairness" or 'justice"-they are simply used differently. That is, when a judge says that a decision "promote [s] justice,"8 6 ~~he or she~~ [they] is not speaking about a tangible, actual result. In contrast, when a judge expresses that a decision will open the floodgates of litigation, he or she [they] is saying that there will be actual, cognizable caseload results from the decision. Given how often the floodgates do not open when we are warned that they will,"' making the argument without a proper foundation is dangerous. While there certainly are situations in which a judge should consider the implications of a decision on ~~his or her~~ [their] caseload, 8 doing so without considering the factual bases of those implications is problematic.'8 9 And while uncertainty is an unavoidable part of the law,' 90 the language with which the floodgates argument is regularly employed expresses anything but conjecture and uncertainty. The arguments are forceful; they are intended to conjure "[i] mages of a destructive, elemental force."'9' After all, as Judge Posner notes, "So irregular has been the growth of the caseloads of each of the three tiers of the federal judiciary in the past, and so many and poorly understood are the causes of changes in judicial caseloads, that it is impossible to make responsible predictions about future changes.' 92 The failure of judges to recognize this limitation of the argument reduces the weight afforded thereto.

#### Plan solves---the prospect of antitrust intervention deters violations---that’s Melamed and Shapiro---decreases litigation.

Cheng 13, \*Thomas Cheng, B.A. (Yale), J.D. (Harvard), B.C.L. (Oxon); Attorney & Counsellor, New York State; Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, The University of Hong Kong; (2013, “Putting Innovation Incentives Back in the Patent-Antitrust Interface”, <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1195&context=njtip>), ability edited

Imposing a duty to license on opportunistic patentees may solve this problem. If these patentees know that the courts may step in and mandate licensing at a reasonable royalty rate,214 they will be induced to enter into negotiations with follow-on innovators in good faith.215 The threat of compulsory licensing may become a default background legal rule against which negotiations between initial and follow-on innovators take place. The instances in which the courts need to intervene could be few.

#### Antitrust fervor is at an all-time high---thumps.

Zanfagna 9/7/21, \* [Gary Zanfagna](https://www.paulhastings.com/professionals/garyzanfagna) is an antitrust and competition partner at Paul Hastings LLP; (September 7th, 2021, “Antitrust isn't headed to an inflection point; it's already there”, https://thehill.com/opinion/judiciary/571087-antitrust-isnt-headed-to-an-inflection-point-its-already-there)

The truth is most companies have not had to think too much about antitrust regulations. The basic rules are pretty well known. But that is potentially changing quickly as antitrust concerns focus on not only high-tech companies, but businesses across the economy, from startups to global conglomerates.

It means antitrust is at an important inflection point. Changes are occurring at multiple levels — from [rule reform](https://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/e/1/e171ac94-edaf-42bc-95ba-85c985a89200/375AF2AEA4F2AF97FB96DBC6A2A839F9.sil21191.pdf) to [new applications](https://www.hawley.senate.gov/senator-hawley-introduces-trust-busting-twenty-first-century-act-plan-bust-anti-competitive-big) of existing rules to [increased enforcement](https://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/news-releases?ID=A4EF296B-9072-4244-90AF-54FE43BB0876). Some of these changes are a reflection of the economic upheaval ushered in by the digital economy, which has prompted businesses and governments to look to antitrust rules to solve their problems. Witness [President Biden](https://thehill.com/people/joe-biden)’s [July 9 executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/07/09/executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) whose 72 provisions include requests ranging from asking the FCC to reinstate net neutrality rules to directing the FDA to issue rules to allow more competition in the hearing aid market.

It’s a reflection of a general zeitgeist whose goal is to slow the onslaught of consolidation in technology across industries, from news media to healthcare to agriculture. And it’s gathering momentum as new rules are being proposed from both sides of the aisle.

Many look to the 449-page [“Investigation of Competition in Digital Markets”](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/10/06/technology/house-antitrust-report-big-tech.html?action=click&module=RelatedLinks&pgtype=Article) report from the judiciary committee on antitrust as the opening salvo. The report took aim at Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google, outlining how those once scrappy startups now leverage their market position in ways not seen since “the era of oil barons and railroad tycoons.” The judiciary report’s conclusion: prevent big tech from acquiring smaller tech with tougher policing — and reform antitrust laws.

Both Democrats and Republicans have since voiced their support for such ideas.

Aimed at the seemingly intractable challenges of the digital era, Sen. [Amy Klobuchar](https://thehill.com/people/amy-klobuchar)’s (D-Minn.) “[Antitrust Law Enforcement Reform Act”](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/225/text) would create barriers to prevent consolidation across industries, not just in tech, but in any business that might be connected to “dominant digital platforms.” The legislation would have a prescriptive force, creating a presumption against certain mergers, whether they be in biotech or burgers.

Meanwhile, on the Republican side, Sen. [Josh Hawley](https://thehill.com/people/joshua-josh-hawley) (R-Mo.) has rolled out a bill that looks even more severe, blocking some mergers and acquisitions outright. The [“Trust-Busting for the Twenty-First Century Act”](https://www.hawley.senate.gov/senator-hawley-introduces-trust-busting-twenty-first-century-act-plan-bust-anti-competitive-big) would ban any acquisitions by companies with a market cap of more than $100 billion. The act would also make it easier for the FTC to classify a company’s behavior as anti-competitive, and then extract penalties (including profits) based on that behavior.

And it’s not just the Federal government. Several states have proposed their own legislation to prevent and punish what they see as anti-competitive behavior. Arizona narrowly passed initial legislation that would prevent app store operators, specifically Apple and Google, from forcing developers to use their payment systems.

Meanwhile in New York State, the [Twenty-First Century Anti-Trust Act (S933)](https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2019/s8700/amendment/a) includes a first-of-its-kind state merger notification of any deal in which the buyer would end up with more than $8 million in assets of the target. It would also create an “abuse of dominance” offense and give the N.Y. attorney general rulemaking authority — whether or not the company was based in New York.

These proposals have a long way to go before becoming law, but they demonstrate potentially significant antitrust adjustments coming.

Expanding antitrust view

The ripple effects will be profound, affecting transportation, communications, banking and healthcare companies. Incumbents looking to diversify their business are vulnerable, as are startups looking for profitable partners. Unhappy competitors who feel stymied may look to antitrust rules for remediation. And private equity moves to consolidate fledgling, fragmented industries will face tougher questions about overlap and industry concentration.

So, we are going to see antitrust being used in industries and in ways that haven’t been considered in many years, with views about market concentration expanding to encompass what used to be considered diverse or vertical markets. In fact, both Sen. Klobuchar’s and Sen. Hawley’s proposals specifically target consolidation across industries. Sen. Hawley’s $100 billion ban explicitly targets vertical acquisitions. It would certainly prevent deals like Facebook’s acquisition of WhatsApp or Google’s purchase of Fitbit.

### Biz Con

#### Business confidence low.

Goll 8/24/21, \*Vince Goll; (August 24th, 2021, “US business confidence slows to an eight month low on supply woes”, https://www.independent.ie/business/world/us-business-confidence-slows-to-an-eight-month-low-on-supply-woes-40780967.html)

US business activity continues to downshift, with growth slowing to an eight-month low in August against a backdrop of materials shortages, a lack of labor and an upswing in coronavirus infections.

The IHS Markit flash August composite index of purchasing managers at services and manufacturers dropped to 55.4 from 59.9 a month earlier, the group reported yesterday. Readings above 50 indicate growth and the gauge has decreased each month since hitting a record 68.7 in May.

The pullback this month underscores the extent to which supply chain disruptions are hammering firms already struggling to meet demand. Service providers and manufacturers continue to face challenges attracting workers and obtaining the supplies they need.

At factories, for instance, an IHS gauge of supplier deliveries showed the longest lead times in records back to 2007.

"Not only have supply chain delays hit a new survey record high, but the August survey saw increasing frustrations in relation to hiring," Chris Williamson, chief business economist at IHS Markit, said.

"Jobs growth waned to the lowest since July of last year as companies either failed to find suitable staff or existing workers switched jobs."

Limited capacity is translating into sustained inflationary pressures as well. The group's composite index of input prices increased in August to the second-highest reading in data back to 2009. A measure of prices received also advanced, indicating companies are having some success passing along higher costs.

The IHS Markit index of services activity declined to show the slowest pace of growth since December, while a measure of new business dropped to a one-year low.

#### Turn---antitrust intervention strengthens business confidence---no evidence supports the DA.

Cary et al. 11, \*Messrs. George Cary and Alex Sistla are members of the California and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Mark Nelson is a member of the New York and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Steven Kaiser is a member of the New Jersey and District of Columbia Bars; (2011, “THE CASE FOR ANTITRUST LAW TO POLICE THE PATENT HOLDUP PROBLEM INSTANDARD SETTING”, <https://www.clearygottlieb.com/~/media/organize-archive/cgsh/files/publication-pdfs/the-case-for-antitrust-law-to-police-the-patent-holdup-problem-in-the-standard-setting.pdf>)

Other commentators believe that there are strong policy arguments against employing antitrust law to police the conduct of SSOs because it will undermine the incentives of SSO participants to innovate. For example, David Teece and Edward Sherry have argued that “antitrust intervention” could “re-duce the clarity of [SSO] rules thereby making participation in SSOs more risky and reducing the willingness of firms with valuable IP (and which there-fore presumably have much to contribute to selecting the appropriate standard) to participate.”44 As a result, they contend that there is a “significant risk of slowing down the standards-setting process, thus delaying the adoption of new standards and new products made in accordance with those standards, to the detriment of consumers and of society generally.”45 In effect, Teece and Sherry’s concern is one of delay—antitrust enforcement could delay innovation. In a commentary accompanying Teece and Sherry’s article, Michael Carrier found their claims to be overstated because they failed to engage in any serious antitrust analysis.46 We agree. But more importantly, Teece and Sherry make empirical claims without any evidence. In particular, they do not even offer anecdotal evidence that firms are discouraged from participating in SSOs because of the prospect of antitrust enforcement. Indeed, the opposite could be equally argued: participation in SSOs would be discouraged to the extent that participants could not rely on the commitments of their fellow participants to disclose and abide by other commitments intended to preclude opportunism. Teece and Sherry’s argument sounds a familiar refrain against antitrust: antitrust enforcement discourages procompetitive behavior and therefore should be limited. The conclusion rings hollow without facts.

## 1AR

### States

#### Precedent evinces that state antitrust cause of action will be preempted if alleged tortious conduct is even governed by patent law.

Paul Gugliuzza 15. Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law. 2015. “Patent Trolls and Preemption.” https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1087&context=faculty\_scholarship

The Federal Circuit first rejected the defendants’ field preemption argument, noting that “state unfair competition law regulates conduct in a different field from federal patent law” and that, in any case, “conflict preemption is a more precise means of determining which state law causes of action are preempted than the blunt tool of field preemption.”272 Turning to conflict preemption, the Federal Circuit wrote, consistent with the Supreme Court’s Supremacy Clause-based preemption decisions, that the key question was “whether the state law actions frustrate[d] ‘the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.’”273 But rather than considering the purposes of federal patent law, such as those identified in Kewanee and Bonito Boats (as well as by the Federal Circuit itself in Dow), the court stated that to determine preemption, “we assess a defendant’s allegedly tortious conduct.”274 The court elaborated: “If a plaintiff bases its tort action on conduct that is protected or governed by federal patent law, then the plaintiff may not invoke the state law remedy, which must be preempted for conflict with federal patent law.”275 Then, citing Mallinckrodt, the court noted: “[F]ederal patent law bars the imposition of liability for publicizing a patent in the marketplace unless the plaintiff can show that the patent holder acted in bad faith.”276 Ultimately, the court remanded the case for the district court to analyze preemption under the bad faith standard.277

### Tradeoff DA

#### A---Oil and gas.

Justin **Sink and** David McLaughlin 8/30/21. Staff writer for the Hill and Bloomberg writer. “FTC Targets Oil-and-Gas Deals, Franchises Amid Pain At Pump.” https://www.yahoo.com/now/ftc-targets-oil-gas-mergers-134500600.html

The Federal Trade Commission is examining ways to crack down on mergers in the oil and gas industry and investigate whether gas station franchises are driving up gas prices as part of a Biden administration effort to combat higher costs at the pump.

FTC Chair Lina Khan is directing staff to identify new legal theories to challenge retail fuel station deals and investigate possible collusion by national chains to push up prices, she said in an Aug. 25 letter to White House economic adviser Brian Deese obtained by Bloomberg News.

“I will be taking steps to deter unlawful mergers in the oil and gas industry,” Khan said. “Over the last few decades, retail fuel station chains have repeatedly proposed illegal mergers, suggesting that the agency’s approach has not deterred firms from proposing anticompetitive transactions in the first place.”

The FTC is planning to ratchet up investigations into abuses in the retail fuel station franchise market, she added.

Pennsylvania. She is also an alumna of the Fellowships at Auschwitz for the Study of Professional Ethics, a program in Germany and Poland that explores the ethics of reporting on politics, war and genocide (Alexandra, “How Biden's tech trustbuster could change health care,” *Politico*, <https://www.politico.com/newsletters/future-pulse/2021/08/25/how-bidens-tech-trustbuster-could-change-health-care-797333>)

#### B---Health care.

Levine 8-25-2021, master’s degree from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and a bachelor of arts in English from the University of Pennsylvania. She is also an alumna of the Fellowships at Auschwitz for the Study of Professional Ethics, a program in Germany and Poland that explores the ethics of reporting on politics, war and genocide (Alexandra, “How Biden's tech trustbuster could change health care,” *Politico*, <https://www.politico.com/newsletters/future-pulse/2021/08/25/how-bidens-tech-trustbuster-could-change-health-care-797333>)

Lina Khan’s Federal Trade Commission has its eyes on health care. The agency known for efforts to rein in Big Tech companies like Facebook and Amazon is also enmeshed in high-stakes health care and health tech battles that extend well beyond Silicon Valley. Case in point: The FTC trial that kicked off yesterday examining monopoly concerns in the market for cancer screening technology. (More on that below.) That closely watched antitrust case — involving the giant Illumina and startup Grail — predates Khan’s confirmation as FTC chair. But it underscores how health issues are looming over the agenda, particularly heading into the pandemic's second year. The way health care companies and consumer health apps handle sensitive data “is an area that I'm sure [Khan’s] very, very interested in,” said Jessica Rich, former director of the FTC’s consumer protection bureau, adding that the Biden administration's FTC will also be closely scrutinizing hospital mergers. “I expect her and the commission to take a very bold approach to what constitutes harm for both,” Rich said. “I expect her to pay close attention to algorithms and potential discrimination in health care, both denials and pricing issues which the FTC's laws can address.” The FTC’s jurisdiction touches nearly the entire health economy. While its competition bureau looks at health care mergers like the Illumina-Grail deal, its consumer protection side is focused on health privacy and data security issues, as well as fighting bogus medical claims on everything from weight loss to Covid cures. When Congress passed the Covid-19 Consumer Protection Act last year, the agency was granted new authority to police Covid scams. Although Khan hasn't spoken publicly about her health care agenda, she's likely to take issue with health apps and companies whose business models maximize, incentivize and monetize data collection. Of particular concern is how firms disclose what they’re doing with consumers’ data — and whether it may still be deceptive or unfair.

#### No oil wars.

Meierding 20, assistant professor of national security affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. (Emily, 8-2-2020, "The Exaggerated Threat of Oil Wars", *Lawfare*, https://www.lawfareblog.com/exaggerated-threat-oil-wars)

Happily, the historical record indicates that China and its neighbors are unlikely to escalate their energy sparring. Contrary to overheated rhetoric, countries do not actually “take the oil,” to use President Trump’s controversial and inaccurate phrase. Instead, my recent research demonstrates that countries avoid fighting for oil resources.

No Blood for Oil

Between 1912 and 2010, countries fought 180 times over territories that contained—or were believed to contain—oil or natural gas resources. These conflicts ranged from brief, nonfatal border violations, like Turkish jets entering Greek airspace, to the two world wars. Many of these clashes—including World War II, Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait (1990), the U.S. invasion of Iraq (2003), the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988), the Falklands War (1982), and the Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay (1932-1935)—have been described as classic oil wars: that is, severe international conflicts in which countries fight to obtain petroleum resources.

However, a closer look at these conflicts reveals that none merits the classic “oil war” label. Although countries did fight over oil-endowed territories, they usually fought for other reasons, including aspirations to regional hegemony, domestic politics, national pride, or contested territories’ other strategic, economic, or symbolic assets. Oil was an uncommon trigger for international confrontations and never caused major conflicts.

On approximately 20 occasions, over almost a century, countries engaged in minor conflicts to obtain oil resources. However, these “oil spats” were brief, mild, mostly nonfatal, and generally involved countries whose hostility predated their resource competition. Greece and Turkey have prosecuted oil spats. So have China and Vietnam, Guyana and Venezuela, and a dozen other pairs of countries. These confrontations inspired aggressive rhetoric while they were underway, but none of them ever escalated into a larger armed conflict.

#### No catastrophic shocks — the market is resilient and self-corrects

Blagden & Porter 21, \*David, Senior Lecturer in International Security at the University of Exeter, \*\*Patrick, Professor of International Security and Strategy at the University of Birmingham. (2-21-2021, “Desert Shield of the Republic? A Realist Case for Abandoning the Middle East”, *Security Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/09636412.2021.1885727, pg. 26-27)

The hydrocarbon market itself is changing and becoming more resilient, meanwhile.80 Western economic exposure to oil shocks is reducing, thanks to increases in efficiency. These increases come from several factors, including the development of North American shale, other stocks becoming increasingly accessible through improving extraction technologies, better-managed shipping routes/fleets, and the capacity to call on public/private inventories and the redistributing function of the International Energy Agency. Spare capacity and strategic petroleum reserves are also now better used to moderate supply shocks. The United States already has adaptive mechanisms, apart from security guarantees and bases, that it can use to mitigate disruptions. Indeed, in every oil shock since 1973, these mechanisms have been used, increasing production from other sources.81 And such market evolutions simultaneously diminish supply manipulation’s utility as a coercive lever, both for OPEC as a whole and for major vendors therein. Even the 1973 oil embargo crisis was created not primarily by the drop in production, which only fell by 2–4%, but by the Nixon administration’s imposition of price controls.82 Large-scale disruptions to oil markets—for instance, the Iran–Iraq War of the 1980s—historically led to rapid third-party adaptation, meanwhile.83 As Justin Logan observes, “a major disruption in one location, temporarily reducing global supply and raising prices, incentivizes producers elsewhere to increase oil production.”

### Court Clog

**More evidence.**

**Stern, 03** – J.D. Candidate, 2004, University of Pennsylvania Law School; B.A., 2001, The Johns Hopkins University. (Toby J., “FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEARING THE "FLOODGATES OF LITIGATION," UPenn Journal of Law, 2004, <https://www.law.upenn.edu/journals/conlaw/articles/volume6/issue2/Stern6U.Pa.J.Const.L.377(2003).pdf)>

Judge Posner undoubtedly was correct in noting that the question of whether judges should consider caseload when deciding cases is of some moment" because of the high caseload levels in the federal courts.00 In arguing that the "floodgates of litigation" argument has few valid uses, I have not ignored the fact that the federal courts are quite busy. Nonetheless, I have tried to create a compelling case against using the fear of the floodgates of litigation in judicial opinions as a remedy for the caseload problem. The argument is too flawed to continue to be used in the judicial opinions of the federal courts. The **pragmatic uncertainties** and **inconsistencies**,3 0 0 **separation of powers problems**,30 ' **and shaky** (and in most cases, absent) **statutory basis**° ' combine to outweigh any beneficial effect the argument might have.